00110911

BOMBAY BRANCH
OF THE
Royal Asiatic Society.

Digitized with financial assistance from
Shri Brihad Bhartiya Samaj
on 20 February, 2020

00110911

THE

LIFE

OF

ARCHBISHOP CRANMER.

110911

BY THE

REV. HENRY JOHN TODD, M.A.

CHAPLAIN IN ORDINARY TO HIS MAJESTY, PREBENDARY OF YORK, AND RECTOR OF SETTRINGTON, COUNTY OF YORK.

"CRANMER'S MARTYRDOM IS HIS MONUMENT, AND HIS NAME WILL OUTLAST AN EPITAPH OR A SHRINE."—*Strype.*

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

B-d-16

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR C. J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD,

AND WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL.

1831.

110911

CONTENTS

OF VOL. II.

BOOK II.

CHAPTER I.

EDWARD VI.

1547.

PAGE

The accession of Edward—Cranmer's commission as archbishop from the new sovereign—His speech at the coronation of the king—He proceeds cautiously to the abandonment of transubstantiation and the mass—His opinions of Romish ceremonies as resembling those of the heathens—Confirmed by many of our divines—General visitation of the kingdom—Injunctions—Homilies—The Paraphrase of Erasmus—Queries preparatory to the first Communion Service—The Answers of Cranmer—The Order of the Service published 1

CHAPTER II.

1547 to 1548.

Proceedings of the convocation—Marriages of priests—Of divorces—Cranmer officiates at the obsequy for the French king—Directs a thanksgiving on account of the battle of Pinkey—Acts repealed—Bishops appointed by the king's letters patent—Chantries given to the king—State of the Universities—Cranmer's care of his diocese—His kindness to papists—His visitation 25

CHAPTER III.

1548.

PAGE

The first Primer in the reign of Edward—The Catechism, usually called Cranmer's Catechism—Translated from the Latin of Justus Jonas, the elder, as the Latin is from various German treatises—Mistakes relating to it—Other Catechisms, separate, and in our Liturgy 43

CHAPTER IV.

1548 to 1549.

The first Common Prayer Book in Edward the Sixth's reign—Opposed by the rebels in Devonshire—Cranmer undertakes to convince them of their folly..... 64

CHAPTER V.

1549.

The Answers of the archbishop to the fifteen Articles of the Devonshire rebels 76

CHAPTER VI.

1549.

Deprivation of Bonner—Fall of lord Seymour—Latimer's reflections on that nobleman—Proceedings against Anabaptists and other Sectaries—The case of Joan Bocher, commonly called Joan of Kent—The case of Van Paris, a Dutchman—Cranmer's conduct in regard to both—The fall of the Protector—Cranmer's attachment to him..... 140

CHAPTER VII.

1549 to 1550.

PAGE

The old missals and other service-books called in—The new form of ordaining bishops, priests, and deacons—Ponet, the first prelate consecrated by it—Account of him, and of his work, entitled Defence of the Marriages of Priests—Letter to Cranmer on the Celibacy of the Clergy—The Epistles of Ignatius referred to on the subject—Cranmer's and Ridley's treatises against Roman Catholic traditions—Treatise of Bertram against Transubstantiation—Treatises against the Mass—The book of Herman, archbishop of Cologne—Destruction of libraries—Leland, Bale, and Cranmer 166

CHAPTER VIII.

1549 to 1551.

Learned Foreigners in England—Peter Martyr—Bernardine Ochin—Martin Bucer—Paul Fagius—and others—Their appointments—Their opinions—Bucer notices the revenues of the English Church—Cranmer's letter concerning impropriations—John à Lasco's recommendation to Cranmer of more foreigners after the death of Bucer 188

CHAPTER IX.

1549 to 1551.

Cranmer's foreign correspondence—Design of a general union among the Protestant Churches—Cranmer's endeavours to this purpose—Writes to Melancthon, Calvin, and Bullinger, on the subject—Bullinger's address to Edward VI.—Character of Bullinger's sermons—Character of Cranmer's sermons—Bucer on the concord of the Protestant Churches—Cranmer resolves on a national confession of faith—Hooper pro-

PAGE

moted to the see of Gloucester—refuses at first to be consecrated in the usual episcopal dress—Conduct of Cranmer on this occasion—The controversy as to the habits—Hooper submits—The controversy as to the altars—The bishops Day and Heath deprived in consequence of that controversy 219

CHAPTER X.

1550 to 1551.

The archbishop's book upon the sacrament of the Lord's Supper —Frith's book upon the same subject—The answers of bishop Gardiner, now a prisoner in the Tower, and of Dr. Smith, to the archbishop's book—Proceedings against Gardiner—The archbishop's reply to him and to Smith—An explanation of Luther considered—Differently applied by Cranmer 237

CHAPTER XI.

1551 to 1552.

Alienation of lands belonging to the See of Winchester, after the deprivation of Gardiner—Such spoliations then frequent —Cranmer desirous to prevent them—Case of Hooper, bishop of Worcester—Deprivation of Tunstal, bishop of Durham—Cranmer's exertion in behalf of Tunstal—Cranmer's recommendation of Coverdale to be bishop of Exeter—Cranmer's care of Latimer—Latimer's employment at Lambeth—The lady Mary's refusal to conform to the new liturgy—The revision of that liturgy—The ill-health of Cranmer 259

CHAPTER XII.

1552.

Designs against church property—Cecil cautions Cranmer on the subject—Cranmer defends himself against the implication

PAGE

of being rich, in answer to Cecil—Hints to the Master of Jesus College, Cambridge, also his lack of wealth—The forty-two Articles of Religion—The Catechism accompanying them—The Articles not Calvinistic 282

CHAPTER XIII.

1552 to 1553.

The Reformation of Ecclesiastical Laws 325

CHAPTER XIV.

1552 to 1553.

The archbishop in commission to enquire after certain sectaries—The Family of Love—The archbishop in another commission, relating to ecclesiastical goods—Avoids acting in it—His letter respecting it to Cecil—Their intimacy—The declining health of the king—Alteration of the succession in favour of lady Jane Grey—The archbishop's share in the transaction—The king dies—The lady Jane's brief reign 350

BOOK III.

CHAPTER I.

MARY.

1553.

The lady Jane committed to the Tower—Funeral of Edward—The archbishop reported to have restored the service of the mass—His public denial of the report—Summoned before the queen's commissioners and the Council—Committed to the Tower—Accused and declared guilty of high treason—His companions in prison, the lady Jane, Ridley, Bradford, and Latimer—Curious anecdote of the lady 365

CHAPTER II.

1553 to 1554.

PAGE

Mary's promise as to religion—Restoration of the Romish service—Gardiner chancellor of Cambridge—Mary's letter to him—Reformed clergy silenced—Hooper and Coverdale sent to prison—P. Martyr and other Reformers leave the kingdom—Mary's first parliament—The divorce of her mother set aside—The shamelessness of Gardiner in accusing Cranmer as to that divorce—A convocation—Disputes on the corporal presence—Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, sent to Oxford, there to dispute on the same subject—Cranmer's letter relating to the disputation 383

CHAPTER III.

1554.

Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, condemned as heretics—Further remarks of Cranmer on the Oxford disputation—Disputation at Cambridge intended—Hesitation of the Council as to further proceedings with the three prisoners—The treatment of the prisoners—The marriage of Philip and Mary—The consequences of it to Protestantism—Remarks upon it—Anecdote relating to Elizabeth, by one of the remarkers—Persecution of the Reformers 400

CHAPTER IV.

1555.

Cranmer's and other books prohibited—The reunion of the Church of England with that of Rome—Proceedings against Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, renewed—Cranmer first brought before the papal commissioners—His condemnation deferred—Ridley and Latimer condemned and burnt—The conduct of Cranmer upon that occasion 421

CHAPTER V.

1555 to 1556.

PAGE

The archbishop deprived and degraded—He recants—His recantations 462

CHAPTER VI.

1556.

Cranmer retracts his recantations, and is burnt 490

CHAPTER VII.

The archbishop's family at the time of his martyrdom—Seizure of part of his possessions by queen Mary—The restoration in blood of his children, by Act of parliament, in the reign of Elizabeth—Petition of his son Thomas to that sovereign . 512

CHAPTER VIII.

Recapitulation of Cranmer's writings—Review of his character. 519

CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS.

Page 28. for *not of a dissolution* read *not a dissolution.*

61. The Edinburgh Catechism, though, like the Necessary Erudition, it expounds the seven sacraments, like the English formulary here also, was the last that exhibited in Scotland the Romish tenets, and paved the way to entire Protestantism.

69. for *afterwards, revised* read *afterwards revised.*

172. after *Ponet, in a reply to it,* add, Henry Wharton informed Strype that Ponet was not the author of the reply. Strype, in his Life of Archbishop Parker, vindicates the right of Ponet to it.

176. after *another translation of it,* refer to p. 522 for a further account of this book.

200. for *inpropriations* read *impropriating*

253. at the end of the note, add Strype.

387. read *under the great seal.*

405. for *Item, Bread,* read *Item, Butter*

407. note, for *predestination* read *predestination.*

420. read *insidiously soothed,*

454. at the end of the note, read *sake.*" Strype.

THE LIFE

OF

ARCHBISHOP CRANMER.

BOOK II.

CHAPTER I.

EDWARD VI.

1547.

The accession of Edward—Cranmer's commission as archbishop from the new sovereign—His speech at the coronation of the king—He proceeds cautiously to the abandonment of transubstantiation and the mass—His opinion of Romish ceremonies as resembling those of the heathens—Confirmed by many of our divines—General visitation of the kingdom—Injunctions—Homilies—The Paraphrase of Erasmus—Queries preparatory to the first Communion Service—The Answers of Cranmer—The Order of the Service published.

By the will of Henry, Cranmer was now placed at the head of a regency, by which, during the minority of Edward, the kingdom was to be governed. Of the sixteen persons, who composed the regency, the majority inclined to the Protestant cause. In ecclesiastical affairs Cranmer

was indeed the principal agent; in political, he was generally guided by his fellow-regents.

It has been [1] said by Strype that one of the first things now done, in relation to the Church, by means of Cranmer, was that the bishops should be made to depend entirely on the king and his Council; and that from the king they should take commissions for the exercise of their office and jurisdiction, which should last only during the royal pleasure. This, however, was nothing more than the settled acknowledgment, at this time, of the royal supremacy. The archbishop himself and other bishops, in the reign of Henry, had [2] received, in this form, their commissions.

On the 20th of February, the young king was crowned by the archbishop. The ceremonies were abridged, on account of the tender age of Edward; and, instead of a sermon, the following brief address was delivered by Cranmer.

[1] Life of Cranm. B. 2. ch. 1.

[2] Henry Wharton's Corrections of Strype's Life of Cranmer, in p. 141. See also his Specimens of Errors in Burnet, 1693, p. 52. "The order of Council now required the bishops to take out these new commissions, of the same form with those they had taken out in the time of Henry; *in obedience to which order* Cranmer took out his commissions."—Cranmer, however, has been blamed by many writers, as if he had now by *innovation* gone too far. Burnet offers to excuse him by saying that if the nomination was thus placed in the king's hands, the episcopal function was still acknowledged to be of divine appointment!

"[1] Most dread and royal sovereign: The promises your Highness hath made here, at your coronation, to forsake the devil and all his works, are not to be taken in the bishop of Rome's sense, when you commit any thing distasteful to that see, to hit your Majesty in the teeth, as Pope Paul the third, late bishop of Rome, sent to your royal father, saying, *Didst thou not promise, at our permission of thy coronation, to forsake the devil and all his works, and dost thou run to heresy? For the breach of this thy promise knowest thou not, that 'tis in our power to dispose of thy sword and sceptre to whom we please?* We, your Majesty's clergy, do humbly conceive, that this promise reacheth not at your Highness's sword, spiritual or temporal, or in the least at your Highness swaying the sceptre of this your dominion, as you and your predecessors have had them from God. Neither could your ancestors lawfully resign up their crowns to the bishop of Rome or his legates, according to their ancient oaths then taken upon that ceremony.

"The bishops of Canterbury for the most part have crowned your predecessors, and anointed them kings of this land. Yet it was not in their power to receive or reject them, neither did it

[1] This speech is printed in Foxes and Firebrands, or, A Specimen of the Danger and Harmony of Popery and Separation, 1682, Part 2, p. 1. It was found among the inestimable collections of archbishop Usher. Strype.

give them authority to prescribe them conditions to take or to leave their crowns, although the bishops of Rome would encroach upon your predecessors by their act and oil, that in the end they might possess those bishops with an interest to dispose of their crowns at their pleasure. But the wiser sort will look to their claws and clip them.

"The solemn rites of coronation have their ends and utility; yet neither direct force or necessity. They be good admonitions to put kings in mind of their duty to God, but no increasement of their dignity: for they be God's anointed; not in respect of the oil which the bishop useth, but in consideration of their power, which is ordained; of the sword, which is authorized; of these persons, which are elected by God, and endued with the gifts of His Spirit for the better ruling and guiding of his people.

"The oil, if added, is but a ceremony. If it be wanting, that king is yet a perfect monarch notwithstanding, and God's anointed, as well as if he was inoiled. Now for the person or bishop that doth anoint a king, it is proper to be done by the chiefest. But if they cannot, or will not, any bishop may perform this ceremony.

"To condition with monarchs upon these ceremonies, the bishop of Rome (or other bishops owning his supremacy) hath no authority: but he may faithfully declare what God requires at

the hands of kings and rulers, that is, religion and virtue. Therefore not from the bishop of Rome, but as a messenger from my Saviour Jesus Christ, I shall most humbly admonish your royal Majesty what things your Highness is to perform.

"Your Majesty is God's vicegerent, and Christ's vicar within your own dominions, and to see, with your predecessor Josiah, God truly worshipped, and idolatry destroyed; the tyranny of the bishops of Rome banished from your subjects; and images removed. These acts be signs of a second Josiah, who reformed the church of God in his days. You are to reward virtue, to revenge sin, to justify the innocent, to relieve the poor, to procure peace, to repress violence, and to execute justice throughout your realms. For precedents on those kings who performed not these things, the Old Law shews how the Lord revenged his quarrel; and on those kings who fulfilled these things, He poured forth his blessings in abundance. For example, it is written of Josiah, in the book of the Kings, thus: *Like unto him there was no king, that turned to the Lord with all his heart, according to all the Law of Moses; neither after him arose there any like him.* This was to that prince a perpetual fame of dignity, to remain to the end of days.

"Being bound by my function to lay these things before your royal Highness; the one as a reward, if you fulfil, the other as a judgment from

God, if you neglect them; yet I openly declare, before the living God, and before these nobles of the land, that I have no commission to denounce your Majesty deprived, if your Highness miss in part, or in whole, of these performances; much less to draw up indentures between God and your Majesty, or to say you forfeit your crown with a clause for the bishop of Rome, as have been done by your Majesty's predecessors, King John, and his son Henry, of this land. The Almighty God, of His mercy, let the light of his countenance shine upon your Majesty, grant you a prosperous and happy reign, defend you and save you: and let your subjects say, Amen."

The fall of the lord chancellor Wriothesley, and the elevation of Lord Hertford as protector independent of the other regents, almost immediately followed the coronation. In the former the Romish party now lost a powerful champion; in the latter Cranmer found a steady friend. To the views of the archbishop the prelates of [1] York and [2] Ely, were at this time also serviceable, as was he of [3] Rochester also now on the eve of translation to Lincoln. But the greatest aid which, both now and henceforward, he obtained, was from the learning, zeal, and prudence of

[1] Holgate. [2] His intimate friend, Goodrich.

[3] Holbeach, promoted to the see of Lincoln in Aug. 1547. Le Neve's Fasti.

Ridley, his chaplain, [1] not as yet however the bishop elect of Rochester, nor designed as such by Henry, as Burnet erroneously describes him. Ridley had [2] now abandoned, more than a year, the doctrine of transubstantiation, and had communicated to Cranmer his reasons for so doing. Their conferences, and the researches occasioned by them, soon convinced the archbishop that this would be the [3] great and important point of the Reformation in doctrine. But he proceeded with his usual caution. He did not as yet avow a complete concurrence in renouncing the belief of the Romish Church. His answers to queries, however, preparatory to converting the service of the mass into a form of communion, clearly shew that his mind was disencumbered of that belief. These will presently solicit our notice. His chaplain, in the Lent of 1547, was also employed in [4] preaching against the idolatrous veneration of images, holy water, and other superstitious ceremonies. Of such abuses Cranmer, in

[1] Ridley succeeded Holbeach in the see of Rochester, and was consecrated in Sept. 1547. Le Neve.

[2] In 1545. Ridley's Life of Bishop Ridley, 173.

[3] Archbishop Parker accordingly describes Cranmer as admonishing the clergy, at the opening of the convocation in this reign, "how to root out the relics of popery, as plants which our Heavenly Father had not planted;" the very language which he afterwards applied to the rooting out of transubstantiation and the mass.

Ridley, ut supr.

the preceding reign, had repeatedly urged the suppression. Ere a year had passed in the present, he obtained an order of the Council to forbid the processions with tapers on Candlemas day, the giving of ashes on Ash Wednesday, and the carrying of palms on Palm Sunday; and, almost immediately afterwards, another order for the removal of images from the churches. The practices, which were to be abolished, he [1] considered as resembling the festivals to heathen gods. If he has left us no especial illustration of this point, the similarity soon began to be traced by our divines, and by [2] Polydore Virgil had been allowed in Cranmer's own time. It is briefly but forcibly shewn in a sermon, entitled Paganism and Papism paralleled, preached at the Temple Church in 1623 by T. Ailesbury, student of divinity; in his exposition of the Apocalypse by the profoundly learned Henry More; and very [3] largely

[1] Strype.

[2] Though a rigid Romanist, he freely confesses the origin of several of their customs to be from the ancient Pagans. Conformity between Popery and Paganism by T. Seward, M.A. Rector of Eyam, 1746. p. 4. Baronius and other celebrated Romanists admitted the fact. Mussard, Les Conformitez, &c. p. 3. seq.

[3] M. Mussard published at Lyons in 1667 a very curious volume also entitled, Les Conformitez des Ceremonies modernes avec les anciennes, où il est prouvè par des autoritez incontestables que les Ceremonies de l'Eglise Romaine sont empruntées des Payens. This was translated into our language, two years after Middleton's Letter appeared, by J. Dupré.

by J. Stopford in 1675, afterwards bishop of Cloyne, in his Parallel between Rome Pagan and Rome Christian in their doctrines and ceremonies. The celebrated Letter of Middleton from Rome, in later times; and disquisitions which have[1] followed it, upon this interesting subject; are thus at least without the charm of novelty.

[1] Polydore Virgil endeavoured, as the Romanists always do, to screen their absurdities under the sanction of *Judaism*; a very poor plea, supposing it true, to reduce the Gentile Christians under the bondage of those *beggarly elements*, from which the great apostle of the Gentiles, by the directions of the Holy Spirit, so often hazarded his life to deliver them. Seward, ut supr. 38. This point has been powerfully considered by a very learned prelate of the present day. "The parallel traced by Middleton, in his celebrated Letter from Rome, between the popish ceremonies and the rites of paganism, includes the use of oil, and of incense, and of holy water for lustration, the frivolous distinction of meats and of days, votive offerings suspended in temples, images, garlands, processions, &c. the burning of lamps and candles before shrines, pretended miracles and legends, with a multitude of other resemblances, which indicate beyond a doubt one principal source of the corruptions of the Church of Rome. It is remarkable however that Middleton's chief opponent, the author of the Catholic Christian Instructed, contends that he has referred to *Paganism* what properly belongs to *Judaism*; and he takes great pains to prove that most of the practices mentioned by Middleton are imitations of Jewish ceremonies. Doubtless there is much truth in the statement of this popish adversary: but his cause gains little by this mode of defence. He points out indeed a more venerable source of error: but his vindication supports the very argument I am maintaining; that the Church of Rome, infected with the love of this world, artfully palliated the cor-

But more extensive declarations of doctrine had now been formed, entitled [1] Homilies, which remain to this day an unaltered system of faith. They are in number twelve. Of these at least three, if not a [2] fourth, appear to have been written by Cranmer himself. If internal evidence had been wanting in support of this belief, the authority of nearly contemporary assertion exists. John Woolton, the nephew of the celebrated Alexander Nowell, was the author of several theological works in the reign of Elizabeth. He became bishop of Exeter. Not long before he was advanced to the prelacy, he published, in

ruption by adopting rites once sanctified and established in the service of the true God, but which being adapted to a temporal kingdom, and to a carnal and less enlightened dispensation, are an evidence of a falling away from Christ, and of a decay of pure religion." Serm. at Chester, Nov. 5, 1826, by E. Copleston, D.D. dean of Chester, (now bishop of Llandaff,) p. 11.

[1] Two printers were employed in the publication of them in 1547, Grafton and Whitchurch; the first in July, the other in August.

[2] The authority, which follows, for stating that Cranmer wrote the three homilies on Salvation, Faith, and Good Works, I first submitted to public notice in the Declarations of our Reformers, which I published in 1818. Introduct. p. xiii. Dr. Wordsworth is of opinion that Cranmer wrote also the homily Of the Misery of all Mankind. Eccl. Biogr. iii. 505. I should rather attribute to his pen that against the Fear of Death, there being among the fragments of his composition, given by Strype, part of a discourse on this subject.

1576, The Christian Manual, in which he says, "[1] What we teach and think of Good Works, those Homilies written in our English tongue of *Salvation, Faith,* and *Works,* by that light and martyr of Christ's church, Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, do plain testify and testify and declare; which are built upon so sure a foundation, that no sycophant can deface them, nor sophister confute them, while the world shall endure."

The dioceses were now divided into six circuits; and by the royal appointment were to be visited by distinguished persons both of the laity and clergy, (in no instance exceeding six,) by whom abuses were to be rectified, and to whom were given a book of Injunctions principally renewing those that had been ordered by Cromwell, and the book of Homilies that had now been prepared. Of the former a copy was by them to be delivered to every incumbent, with a charge of strict attention to them; and of the latter, for the instruction of the people, a copy was to be placed in every parish church. That the New Testament might be better understood, the [2] Paraphrase of Erasmus,

[1] Chr. Man. sign. c. iii.

[2] The first volume of the Paraphrase consisted of the four Gospels and the Acts, and was published in 1548. Malet, who had already assisted Cranmer in regard to the church-service, (see before, vol. i. p. 198,) and Udall, a canon of Windsor, both distinguished scholars and divines, are believed to have

translated into English, was also directed to be deposited in the several churches, as soon as it should be received. Such were the substitutes at present for sermons; restrictions upon preaching being now imposed, on account of recent unprofitable controversies in the pulpit. To the admission of the Paraphrase and the Homilies objections were immediately made by Gardiner and Bonner. The former had been invited by Cranmer to join in the formation of the Homilies, and had not only refused, but had cautioned the archbishop against innovating in religion during the king's minority. The compilation being now shewn to him, he at once expressed his disapprobation of it, and in such a way, as to occasion his being sent to the Fleet prison; the charge against him being disobedience to the royal injunctions. Cranmer now entreated him to abandon the pertinacity under which he had acted, and to concur in the proceedings which by the members of the Council had been directed. Gardiner persisted in his opposition. He asserted that the Homilies contained false doctrine, especially in teaching justification by faith alone without works; and as he knew that Cranmer had composed the homily on the salvation of mankind, he scrupled not to charge him as the

translated the greater part, and to have superintended, with the aid of Coverdale also, the whole of these paraphrases; the remainder of which on the Epistles appeared in 1549.

author of the following syllogism: "We are justified by faith without all works of the Law: Charity is a work of the Law: Therefore we are justified without charity." But with Strype I warn the reader to consult the homily itself, before he pass his judgment upon the pretended argument of Cranmer. To this homily the refractory prelate offered another objection, as being repugnant, in the point before us, to the Necessary Erudition of 1543. In vain the archbishop told him that his meaning was not "that justifying faith was ever without charity, and that even faith did not justify as a meritorious condition, but only as it was an [1] instrument applying to sinners the divine mercy; that is, "[1] *through which*, and not *by which*, we are justified." The component parts of justifying faith, he might have added, are in the homily what they are in the elder formulary; for the homily affirms, that faith "[2] *does not exclude* repentance, hope, love, dread, and the fear of God," which are to "be joined with faith in every man that is justified." Essentially the Erudition is the same. "[3] No faith is sufficient for salvation, but such a

[1] Burnet, iii. 135. And Bishop of Salisbury's Append. to his Charge, Justification by Faith only, &c. 1828. p. 101.

[2] Homily on Salvation, edit. 1548. Later editions alter *exclude* into *shut out*.

[3] Nec. Erudit. Art. of Justification.

faith as worketh by charity." Hence the [1] assertion of the venerable and judicious Hooker, "that they, who affirm that we are justified by faith only, may yet hold truly that *without works we are not justified;*" a position which follows from the inseparable connection of faith with good works. The design of our first reformers [2] undoubtedly was to acquaint the people with the method of salvation according to the Gospel; to bid them not rely with Romanists on external works and merit, nor with some mistaken Gospellers (a party being then so named) on a mere inoperative faith. The latter, whom Hooper, in a tract published in the [3] same year with the present homilies, denominates "new Evangelists," "*dream,*" (said he) "of faith that justifieth, the which neither *repentance precedeth,* neither *honesty of life followeth.*" The former relied "[4] on the merit of their own works towards justification, such as pilgrimages to images, kneeling, kissing, and censing of them, as well as many other hypocritical and feigned works *in their state of religion,* there being marts or markets of *merits,* full of holy relics, images, shrines, and works of supererrogation, ready to be sold; and all things which

[1] Bp. of Salisb. ut supr. 133.
[2] Ridley, Life of Bp. Ridley.
[3] Abp. Laurence, Bampt. Lect. Serm. Notes, p. 382.
[4] Homily of Good Works.

they had were called [1] holy; holy cowls, holy girdles, holy pardons, holy beads, holy shoes, holy rules." The present compilation earnestly inculcated an active obedience, the acceptance of which is however to be attributed, as Cranmer in another discourse on Justification teaches, to the merits and benefits of Christ alone, on account of which, " [2] we being sorry that we cannot do all things more exquisitely and duly, all our works shall be accepted and taken of God as most exquisite, pure, and perfect." If in later times learned foreigners, or Englishmen, " [3] tinctured in their exile," contemplated the great subject upon which Cranmer and Gardiner now differed, and which since their days to the present has been the fertile parent of controversy, only in the sense in which it is applied by the [4] followers of Calvin; it has been powerfully answered, " [5] that our Reformers entertained no such idea of its application. They believed it not to be a bless-

[1] As in the Morality, already cited. See vol. i. p. 330.

[2] Strype, Append. No. xxxi.

[3] Ridley, Life of Bp. Ridley.

[4] Heylin, speaking of the Calvinistic controversies, observes, that the Reformers allowing the Paraphrases of Erasmus, " a man of known difference in judgment from Calvin's doctrines," to be translated into English, is a proof how much the priest as well as the people were expected to ascribe to the judgment of that learned man, and consequently how little unto Calvin, in those controversies. Introduct. to Life of Abp. Laud, p. 36.

[5] Abp. Laurence's Serm. 107.

ing, which we may in vain sigh to behold above our reach, granted to certain individuals alone, and always granted irrespectively, by a divine decree, fixed and immutable; but one, which we all possess in our infancy, and of which nothing but our own folly can deprive us. They never asserted the total inability of a Christian to perform a good action, or even think a good thought, until the arrival of some destined moment, when it shall please God, without his own endeavours, to illuminate his understanding, and renovate his affections. The gift of grace, not to be purchased by human merit, but always bestowed gratuitously, they confined not to a selected few the predestinated favourites of Heaven, but extended to all, who neither by wilful perversity oppose its reception, nor, when received, by actual crime discard it."

The Paraphrase of Erasmus, bad enough in itself, said Gardiner, was made still worse by the English version of it. The original he pronounced an abomination. He professed to agree with those who said "[1] that Erasmus laid the eggs, and Luther hatched them." We wonder no longer at his spleen. His objections to the translation were [2] frivolous. His statement of opposition between the homilies and the paraphrase was disregarded

[1] Burnet. Strype. Ridley.

[2] Jortin pronounces them also *malicious*. Erasm. i. 609.

alike by the Reformers themselves, and the people to whom the books were sent. Le Clerc [1] gives to Cranmer an answer upon this occasion, which belongs to one of the translators of the paraphrase; that, like all other theological books except the Scriptures, the paraphrase was not infallible and absolutely faultless, but that it was the very best of the kind; that it was therefore more expedient to adopt the interpretations of so learned a man, than to make new ones which would still be more exposed to censure; and that Erasmus, all things considered, was the most impartial of all expositors. By the royal Injunctions the [2] works of Erasmus were now directed to be placed in the libraries of cathedrals. The theological pieces of Erasmus indeed had long been well received in our country; and numerous were the English translations of them, which certainly had contributed to the progress of the [3] Reformation. To the paraphrase Gardiner

[1] Remarks on the Works of Erasmus. Jortin, ii. 105. But Strype assigns the answer rightly to one of the translators, Nicholas Udall.

[2] The dean and chapter of York are enjoined, in 1547, to have in their library, within one year from that time, St. Augustine, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, Ambrose, Chrysostome, Cyprian, Theophylact, *Erasmus*, and other good writers' works. MSS. Dean & Ch. fol. 46. a.

[3] 1. Erasmus on the sacrament, and an exhortation to the study and reading of the Gospel, lately translated into English, 1522.

could not but object, still further than upon a theological dissent, when the printed book was first offered to his view. It contained dedications to her, whose ruin he is believed to have designed, the dowager queen Catharine Parr; and from such a call to reminiscence he would shrink. However, his continued opposition reconducted him to the Fleet, where he was detained during the session of the parliament. Bonner, less contumacious, had endured a shorter imprisonment.

In November the parliament was assembled, and at the same time a convocation of the clergy; Cranmer then informing them, "[1] that it had been the custom in England, in the first year of the reign of every prince, to summon a parliament, and likewise to call a synod; and that therefore

2. Of the same date, An exhortation to the diligent study of Scripture, made by Erasmus, and lately translated into English, which he fixed before the New Testament.

3. Erasmus, Of confession, about the year 1542.

4. Of the great mercy of God, translated by Gentian Hervet from Erasmus, about 1547.

Many other translations, at a later date, of his useful treatises might be added. For the earl of Wiltshire too he had written several. See before, vol. i. p. 22. In the very year which elevated the earl's daughter to the throne, an exposition of the Creed and the Ten Commandments in our native tongue was "put forth by this famous clarke mayster Erasmus of Roterodame at the request of the earl." Ames.

[1] Synodalia MSS. Cantab. Kennet.

it was now the command of the king, and the expectation of his Council, that the prelates and clergy should consult among themselves how rightly to settle the true religion of Christ." On the 22d of that month the convocation submitted that the ecclesiastical law might be examined and promulged, according to the statute in the reign of Henry; and that the labours of a committee for examining, reforming, and publishing the order of divine service, might be produced; that the clergy of the lower house might sit, as in former times, in the lower house of parliament; and that the payment of the first-fruits for benefices might be moderated. On the last day of the month, the form of an ordinance, delivered by the archbishop, for receiving the body of our Lord under both kinds, namely, of bread and wine, was exhibited and read; and on the second of December was unanimously adopted.

Before this decision was made, written questions, as in the former reign, were circulated; and the answers of several prelates upon the great subject of the Eucharist have been preserved. Those of Cranmer, which apparently led to the production of our first communion service, were as follow.

[1] To the first question, *Whether the sacrament of the altar was instituted to be received of one man*

[1] Burnet, ii. Rec. No. 25.

for another, or to be received of every man for himself? Cranmer answers, The sacrament of the altar was not instituted to be received of one man for another, but to be received of every man for himself.

To the second, *Whether the receiving of the said sacrament of one man doth avail and profit any other?* he replies, The receiving of the said sacrament by one man doth avail and profit only him that receiveth the same.

To the third, *What is the oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the Mass?* his answer is, The oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the Mass is not so called because Christ indeed is there offered, and sacrificed, by the priest and the people, (for that was done but once by himself upon the cross;) but is so called because it is a [1] memory and representation of that very true sacrifice, and immolation, which before was made upon the cross.

To the fourth, *Wherein consisteth the Mass by Christ's institution?* he replies, The Mass by Christ's institution consisteth in those things which be set forth in the Evangelists, *Matt.* 26, *Mark* 14, *Luke* 22, 1 *Cor.* 10 and 11.

To the fifth, *What time the accustomed order began first in the Church, that the priest alone*

[1] As in our present Communion Service, "a perpetual *memory* (memorial) of that his precious death until his coming again."

should receive the sacrament? he answers, I think the use, that the priest alone did receive the sacrament without the people, began not within six or seven hundred years after Christ.

To the sixth, *Whether it be convenient that the same custom continue still within this realm?* his reply is, I think it more agreeable to the Scripture and Primitive Church, that the first usage should be restored again, that the people should receive the sacrament with the priest.

To the seventh, *Whether it be convenient that masses satisfactory should continue, that is to say, priests hired to sing for souls departed?* his answer is, I think it not convenient that satisfactory masses should continue.

To the eighth, *Whether the Gospel ought to be taught, at the time of the Mass, to the understanding of the people being present?* he replies, I think it very convenient that the Gospel concerning the death of Christ, and our redemption, should be taught to the people in the Mass.

To the ninth, *Whether in the Mass it were convenient to use such speech as the people may understand?* he answers, I think it convenient to use the vulgar tongue in the Mass, except in certain mysteries, whereof I doubt.

To the tenth and last, *When the reservation of the sacrament, and the hanging up of the same began?* his reply is, The reservation of the sacrament began, I think, six or seven hundred years after

Christ: the [1] hanging up, I think, began of late time.

The Order of the Communion, in March, 1547-8, now appeared with the royal proclamation, stating the consent of the lords and commons assembled in parliament, "that, agreeably to Christ's holy institution, the most blessed sacrament of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ should thenceforth be commonly delivered and ministered unto all persons within our realm of England and Ireland, and other our dominions, under both kinds." The office opened with an exhortation to be read by the minister on the Sunday or holiday preceding the administration of the sacrament; and it required those, who might still make choice of auricular confession to the priest, not to censure such as thought a general confession to God sufficient, and those, who confessed only to God, not to be offended with such as applied to auricular confession. The minister, having himself received the sacrament, was directed

[1] Meaning the pix, or little box, in which the consecrated host was kept, and which was then accustomed to be hung up above the altar. But see Cranmer's own remarks on this subject in his answer to the fourth article of the Devonshire rebels, which will presently be before us. Strype tells of a youth of St. John's College, Cambridge, who, about this time, was reported as an offender to the archbishop (by whom however no punishment appears to have been directed) for having secretly in hatred to the mass, cut the string by which the box was suspended. Life of Cranm. B. 2. ch. 6.

then to address the people in the [1] form which is still retained (though not in the same part of the office) in our present communion service; after which the impenitent were entreated by him to withdraw, the penitent to draw near; and then the general confession, as it now stands, followed, together with the general absolution preceded by a declaration, which in the entire liturgy that soon was formed is omitted, of the power of the Church to absolve penitent sinners. Burnet has contradicted himself, and misled later ecclesiastical historians, in [2] saying that the Order was received, throughout the kingdom, without any opposition. He had, just before, more correctly stated, that they who were for the old superstition were much troubled to find private confession thus left indifferent; that a general confession also of sins was to be used, with which they apprehended that most would content themselves, and that the accustomed absolution and indulgences would be laid aside; as indeed they soon were. The new office was therefore not received with general approbation. There were [3] prelates too that strengthened, by their equivocal conduct in respect to it, the aversion of the Romanists; and there were [4] some of the parochial clergy who hoped to ex-

[1] "Dearly beloved in the Lord, ye that mind to come," &c.

[2] Hist. Ref. Part II. B. i.

[3] Heylin, Hist. Ref. 59. Gardiner of Winchester, Bonner of London, Veysie of Exeter, and Sampson of Chichester.

[4] Heylin, 59. 63.

cite, by their account of it, disaffection to the government. To restrain the folly of [1] such preachers, to allow none indeed now to preach who were not licenced by the lord protector, or the archbishop, a proclamation was immediately issued.

[1] Heylin, 60.

CHAPTER II.

1547 to 1548.

Proceedings of the convocation—Marriages of priests—Of divorces—Cranmer officiates at the obsequy for the French king—Directs a thanksgiving on account of the battle of Pinkey—Acts repealed—Bishops appointed by the king's letters patent—Chantries given to the king—State of the Universities—Cranmer's care of his diocese—His kindness to papists—His visitation.

THE session of the convocation in 1547 did not close without an [1] address to the archbishop, requesting from him a determinate answer as to the indemnity and impunity the members might have, if they treated, in cases forbidden by the statutes of the realm to be discussed, of matters of religion. The entire repeal of the Six Articles accordingly gave them the freedom that was wished. To a [2] proposition that all the canons and laws, which had hitherto forbidden priests to marry, or had proscribed such as were already married, should cease and be utterly void, assent was now

[1] December 9. [2] December 17.

also immediately given by a large majority, of whom, it is curious to relate, [1] many were then single, and never afterwards availed themselves of the right to wed, while several of the opponents to the propositions hastened to enter into the conjugal state. But the parliamentary concurrence in this proceeding was not obtained before February 1548-9; nor then without opposition. The preamble to the Act, however, thus justified the triumphant measure: "Great filthiness of living, with other inconveniences," it stated, "had followed on the laws that compelled chastity, and prohibited marriage; so that it was better that the clergy should be suffered to marry, than to be so restrained. Therefore all laws and canons that had been made against it, being made only by human authority, are repealed; so that all spiritual persons, of what degree soever, might lawfully marry, if they married according to the order of the Church." A [2] proviso was added, that because many divorces of priests had been made after the Six Articles were enacted, and that consequently the women might have married again, all these divorces should be confirmed. This concession, however, was censured by the violent of the Romish party; but was defended, with great learning, in books that were written by

[1] Strype, from Ponet's Defence of the Marriages of Priests, p. 268.

[2] Burnet.

the most distinguished [1] divines of our Reformed Church. Yet their opponents still pronounced the Act a connivance, rather than a direct allowance. About three years afterwards, therefore, another Act was passed, declaring that as many took occasion from words in the former, to say that the marriage of the clergy was only permitted, as usury and other unlawful things were; and thus spake slanderously of such marriages, accounting the children begotten in them illegitimate, to the high dishonour of the king and parliament, and the learned clergy of the realm, who had determined that the laws against the marriages of priests were most unlawful by the Law of God; it was enacted that such marriages should be esteemed good and valid. At that time also was confirmed the second marriage of a nobleman, which, on the accession of Mary, was however annulled upon the ground that the divorce from the first had been illegal, whose case at the beginning of the present reign occasioned a commission to be directed to the archbishop, the bishops of Durham and Rochester, Dr. [2] Ridley, and six

[1] Parker, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury; Ponet, bishop of Rochester; Bale, bishop of Ossory; and many more.

[2] Betwixt Ridley, one of the commissioners, and Hooper, there appears to have been a controversy upon the subject three years after, Dr. Ridley says, (Life, &c. p. 208,) which is not mentioned by our historians. Bucer and Martyr too are said to have been consulted by Hooper on the occasion, but to have declined the discussion of divorce. Martyr, however, is re-

others, to inquire— *Whether a man, divorced from his wife for her adultery, might not lawfully marry again.* The [1] marquess of Northampton had married the daughter of Bourchier earl of Essex. She had been guilty of adultery. For this crime the canon law allowed a separation from bed and board, not of a dissolution of the nuptial tie. The papal power, that might once have been sought to render such a marriage void, was now excluded. The question therefore long employed the consideration both of civilians and divines; not one of them, however, so earnestly, it appears, as the archbishop, who first examined the Scriptures, then the opinions of the Fathers and other ancient writers upon the subject, and formed his collections into a large volume which Burnet had seen, and of which he has given a

peatedly cited upon the point, in a curious work, entitled, "Of Divorce for Adultery, and Marrying again; that there is no sufficient warrant so to do. By Edm. Bunney, B.D. Oxford, 1610." See sections 4 and 7. The work had been written many years before, and now was dedicated to Archbishop Bancroft. Martyr appears to have agreed with Erasmus, whose treatise, *Whether dyvorsement betwene man and wyfe standeth with the lawe of God, with divers causes wherefore it is permitted,* &c. was published in English, without date, but most probably about this time, on account of the occurrence which has been related. The press, from which it issued, gives dates to books down to 1548; but also appears to have put forth several without date.

[1] Burnet. Strype.

brief analysis. The [1] conclusion of Cranmer is the allowance of marriage, to the innocent person, just as in the [2] system of ecclesiastical laws soon afterwards by him superintended and designed to be enforced, the bond of marriage is dissolved on account of adultery, and the right of marrying again conceded to the injured party. It is important here to state that they, who prepared this system, are charged by the modern [3] historian of our country with having allowed divorces not only for adultery, but for cruelty, desertion, and *incompatibility of temper*. To such a cause as the last we have already [4] seen the archbishop successfully opposed. Nor is the assertion as to that point in the code of laws correct. The eleventh chapter of them respecting matrimony, and the twelfth respecting adulteries and divorces, clearly [5] show the contrary. While the present deliberations,

[1] Strype.

[2] The offender, it may be added, if the husband, was to give his wife her dowry, and half what he was worth; if it was the wife, she was to forfeit her right of dowry, and whatever else she might claim of her husband by law or promise; and, whether husband or wife, was to be condemned to perpetual banishment, or perpetual imprisonment: judging the practice of the canon law unreasonable, and contrary to Scripture, in destroying the end, duty, and comfort of marriage, but still retaining the bond of obligation of the contract. Ridley, p. 209. See the Ref. Legum Eccl. De Adulteriis, &c. Capp. 3, 4, 5, 19.

[3] Lingard.

[4] See before, vol. i. p. 311.

[5] Hallam, Constit. Hist. of England, 8vo. i. 140.

however, continued, the marquess decided for himself, and married the daughter of Brooke lord Cobham. The delegates resented this precipitancy, the former marriage being yet firm in law; and they reported it to the Council. The bride, by an order of Council, was accordingly separated from her lord, till, after a considerable time, sentence was given in favour of this second marriage, which, as I have observed, was certainly confirmed, though subsequently annulled, by parliament.

Returning to the earlier part of 1547, we [1]find the archbishop, with other prelates, performing in St. Paul's cathedral a solemn obsequy for Francis the first, the friend of the late sovereign; and Ridley delivering the funeral discourse. This was intended as a return of the compliment that had been paid at Paris, not many weeks before, upon the death of Henry.

In the autumn of this year the battle of Pinkey, so fatal to the Scots and so successful to the English, occasioned a direction from the archbishop for a public thanksgiving in celebration of the victory; " [2] such a victory," he says, " as was almost above the expectation of man, and such as has not been heard of in any part of Christendom these many years; above the number of 15000 Scots being slain, 2000 taken prisoners, and among them many noblemen and others of good

[1] Burnet. Ridley. [2] Strype.

reputation, all their ordnance and baggage of their camp being also won from them."

The archbishop's influence was now such as to procure not only the repeal, at the suggestion of the clergy, of the statute of the Six Articles, and a subsequent one that qualified it; but also for the sake of those who apprehended that they might be prosecuted as Lollards, under which appellation the reformers were by their opponents invidiously designated, the statutes that had passed against Lollardism during and since the reign of Richard the Second. The fear of being exposed to the rigour of the laws for doctrinal offences created under the reign of Henry was at the same time removed. The use of Scripture too was now authoritatively unrestrained, as Cranmer had ever wished and studied that it should be. In a word, "[1] all Acts of Parliament concerning doctrine or matters of religion" were "from henceforth repealed." The New Testament of Tindal, the Bible of Matthew, of Coverdale, of Taverner, and of Cranmer, in various forms, and in abundant editions, were accordingly throughout the reign of Edward supplied to the public; and thus was encouraged as much as possible the spirit of religious inquiry, THE RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS.

Towards the close of 1547, Cranmer was principally concerned in the formation of an Act,

[1] Heylin. Burnet.

which withdrew from deans and chapters the election of bishops, and admitted the prelates to their sees by the letters patent of the Crown; and which declared "all jurisdiction both spiritual and temporal to be derived from the king," in whose name therefore all episcopal citations and processes should now run, and with whose arms, instead of their own, their official documents should be sealed. Under their own names and seals the prelates again [1] acted in the reign of Mary, and have since continued so to do. The admission, however, to their sees by the letters patent has been shewn to be [2] no innovation, but a recovery to the Crown of its ancient right. The renewal of it in England has been the wish of one of our most learned divines. "[3] It would be much easier," he observes, "if, instead of the mock elections of bishops by *congè d'elire*, and the operose way of suing out so many instruments, and going through so many offices, and there paying so many fees for them, in order to their full settlements in their preferments, bishops were made here in the same manner, as they are Ireland, *by the king's letters patent;* in which case there would be nothing further necessary than those letters, presenting them to the benefice, as in the case of all other ecclesiastical benefices, in the king's gift, and his mandate to

[1] Heylin, 51.
[2] Ibid. 53.
[3] Life of Dean Prideaux, p 113.

the archbishop to consecrate, institute, and instal them. By these means a great deal of trouble and expence would be saved, and deans and chapters delivered from the great danger of a *præmunire*, to which they are liable in all such elections, if they do not within twenty days return elected the person, whom the king in his letters missive nominates to them."

About the same time the archbishop strenuously opposed the [1] Act which gave to the king all the colleges, free chapels, and chantries, of which the late sovereign was not actually possessed, although to him also they had been given, at a time [2] when Cranmer hoped, as now too it was expected, that the alienation of monastic property might be applied to the foundation of grammar schools, to the improvement of the Universities, or to the increase of small benefices. But he saw the secret motive. For rapacious courtiers, not for the young monarch, or for public good, were the profits intended. The extraordinary phenomenon, as Gilpin calls it, accordingly appeared in the house of lords, —the archbishop of Canterbury at the head of the popish peers contending eagerly against the whole force of the protestant interest, but contending in vain. In the letter of the Act the two Universities were certainly comprehended. They were alarmed; and Cambridge

[1] Heylin. Burnet. Strype.

[2] See before, vol. i. p. 271.

petitioned the archbishop to intercede for a confirmation of its privileges. From both of them the revenues of [1] obits indeed were now [2] transferred to the king to alter, as he might please, in favour of the students, which, however, were applied only to feed the avarice of unworthy men. "[3] If ye had any eyes," said a zealous preacher to his audience in behalf of these seats of learning, "ye should see and be ashamed that, in the great abundance of lands and goods taken from abbies, colleges, and chantries, to serve the king in all necessaries and charges, especially in provision of relief for the poor, and for maintenance of learning, the king is so disappointed that both the poor be spoiled, all maintenance of learning decayed, and you only enriched. But for because you have no eyes to see with, I will declare that which you may hear with your ears, and so perceive and know, that whereas God and the king have been most liberal to give and bestow, there you have been most unfaithful to dispose and deliver. For according unto God's Word, and the king's pleasure, the Universities, which be the schools of all godliness and virtue, should have been nothing decayed, but much increased and amended by the reformation of religion."

Of his own University the preacher has drawn

[1] Anniversary services in commemoration of the dead.

[2] A. Wood, Ann. Univ. Oxon. under the year 1547.

[3] Sermon preached by T. Lever in 1550, cited by Wood, ut supr. He was a fellow of St. John's College.

a picture too interesting to be overpassed: "The small number of poor godly students now remaining in Cambridge," he says, "be not able to tarry, and continue their study in the University, for lack of exhibition and help. There be divers there, which rise daily betwixt four and five of the clock in the morning, and from five until six of the clock use common prayer, with an exhortation of God's Word, in a common chapel, and from six until ten of the clock use ever either private study or common lectures. At ten of the clock they go to dinner, where they be content with a penny piece of beef among iiij, having a few porridge made of the broth of the same beef with salt and oatmeal, and nothing else. After this slender dinner, they be either teaching or learning until five of the clock in the evening, when they have a supper not much better than their dinner. Immediately after the which they go either to reasoning in problems, or unto some other study, until it be nine or ten of the clock; and there, being without fire, are fain to walk or run up and down half an hour, to get a heat on their feet, when they go to bed."

In his visitation of 1548, Cranmer, therefore, inquired whether the encouragement so much wanted was given by those churchmen, who could spend a hundred pounds a year, to the maintenance of scholars in the Universities; a direction

which had been given in the royal [1] Injunctions of 1536, in the first year also of Edward, and was repeated at the beginning of her reign by Elizabeth; and his clergy were now to answer [2] whether those, who were beneficed, for *as many hundred pounds* as every of them might be able to dispend, had supplied a scholar for each hundred either in Oxford or Cambridge, or in some grammar school. There can be no doubt that the archbishop successfully interested himself with the Protector not only in regard to the studies, but also to the revenues and privileges, of both Universities. His own, by their celebrated orator, Roger Ascham, had indeed declared, in their address to him at the beginning of this reign, "that [3] since God had now raised him on purpose for the restoration of the Gospel, and had so long reserved him for that end, *they doubted not that he would give all his pains and authority to preserve the welfare of learning*." Nor were they disappointed. By consulting with [4] Ascham himself, and with Sir John Cheke, another accomplished scholar of the age, Cranmer was soon enabled to improve the general character of Cambridge; and to support and patronize the classical studies that had there been neglected; whither also, ere long, he sent the

[1] See before, vol. i. p. 172.

[2] Articles of Visitation, Sparrow's Collect. 1661. 25, seq.

[3] Strype. [4] Ibid.

great protestant divines, Bucer and Fagius, as professors of divinity and of the Hebrew language; as at Oxford he placed in the theological chair, which had been deserted by Smith, Peter Martyr.

Meanwhile the archbishop was proceeding in the visitation of his diocese. Upon this occasion another notable inquiry to his clergy was,[1] whether on every Sunday and holiday they used the prayer set forth by the king for peace between England and Scotland. This[2] prayer was probably that which was sent to the archbishop by the Council on the 6th May, 1548, when the Scots, entering into new agreements with France, seemed still to threaten war with England; and therefore devout intercessions to God were now to be made "for victory and peace." The latter indeed was obtained early in 1550, and in the interval was inserted in our first Liturgy the suffrage, "Give peace in our time, O Lord," with the response, "Because there is none other that fighteth for us, but only Thou, O God." Another prayer for peace with Scotland had been issued in the first year of the king's reign indeed; but the archbishop's visitation was in the[3] second year.

Another visitatorial question by the archbishop was, "Whether his clergy preached, or caused to be preached, purely and sincerely, the Word of God, exhorting their parishioners to the works commanded by Scripture, and not to works

[1] Art. of Vis. ut supr. [2] Strype.
[3] Bishop Sparrow, Strype.

devised by men's fancies besides Scripture, such as wearing and praying upon beads, and such-like." Here he plainly refers to the larger distinction in his own excellent Homily of Good Works, just as Ridley, in his Injunctions soon afterwards, forbids the maintenance of "[1] the justification of man *by his own works*, (those which Cranmer calls the devices of human fancy,) holy bread, palms, ashes, candles, sepulchre paschal, creeping to the cross, hallowing of the fire or altar, or any such-like abuses and superstitions, now taken away by the king's most godly proceedings."

The following was also a very important inquiry, adopted from the royal Injunctions: [2] Whether his clergy had declared, and to their wits and power had persuaded the people, that the manner, and kind, of fasting in Lent and other days in the year, is a mere positive law; and that therefore all persons having just cause of sickness or other necessity, or being licensed by the king, might moderately eat all kinds of meat, without grudge or scruple of conscience. Himself had before [3] readily conceded a licence of this kind to Roger Ascham, who was a man of delicate health, and who had written to him a learned epistle on the subject, seeming to consider the fasting as a political institution rather than as a religious duty.

Yet one more important question, repeated by

[1] Burnet, ii. Rec. 206.

[2] Art. of Vis. ut supr.

[3] Strype.

the archbishop to his clergy from the Injunctions of the king, must be noticed. It was [1] whether they had diligently exhorted their parishioners, and especially when they made their wills, to give to the poor men's box, that was then placed in churches, "what they had been wont to bestow upon pardons, pilgrimages, trentals, masses satisfactory, decking of images, offering of candles, going to friars, and upon other like blind devotions."

Among the inquiries, now addressed to the laity also, the following are of great interest. They were to answer, [2] whether in the time of the Litany, or any other part of Common Prayer, or in the time of the sermon or the homily, any had departed out of the church without a just and necessary cause; or, while the minister was officiating, had been used to commune, jangle, talk, or occasion any disturbance in the service. For this there had been especial cause. [3] One who had been an abbot, but was now vicar of Stepney near London, still addicted to the old superstition, and by his influence as well as example encouraging others to remain in it, had been accustomed to disturb the preachers in his church, (for he declined to preach in it himself,) by challenging the subject of their discourses, or by causing the bells to be rung, while they were in the pulpit.

[1] Art. of Vis. ut supr. [2] Ibid. [3] Strype.

The parishioners at length convened him before Cranmer, who dismissed him with lenity, and bade him offend no more. That lenity offended the accusers, and probably gave occasion to similar disturbances, in order to the suppression of which the visitatorial articles were probably formed. There had been no law *then* (in 1547) by which to punish such offenders, said Cranmer to an accuser of the Stepney vicar. The dialogue, which followed, is interesting. "[1] No law?" the parishioner replied, adding, "If I had your Grace's authority, I would be bold enough to unvicar him, or inflict some sharp punishment upon him and *such others*. If it ever come to their turn, [the papists',] they will shew you no such favour." —"Well," said Cranmer, "If God so provide, we must abide it."—This, Strype observes, was the constant behaviour of the archbishop towards papists, and such as were his enemies. To these an author, nearly contemporary with the archbishop, thus alludes: "[2] Did ever those papists, *whose lives were saved* by good bishop Cranmer's means, who were brought up, who were defended, who

[1] Strype.

[2] Norton's Warning against the dangerous practice of Papistes, impr. by J. Day, sign. L. iii. b. This writer alludes to "a *decayed knight*" also, who had imposed upon Cranmer's kindness; "the archbishop upon a good hope" of his regard for the reformed religion, "having given him *fifty pound yearly pension*." Sign. G. iii. b.

were advanced, *who were shielded from harm and peril by him,* once requite him with one drop of kindness? And yet they spake him fair in his prosperity!"

The laity too were now asked, [1] whether the clergy had explained to them the true use of *ceremonies,* namely, that they are not workers nor works of salvation, but only outward signs and tokens to put us in remembrance of things of higher perfection. Thus, when the first service-book was revised, it was declared that the [2] alterations which were made in it proceeded from *curiosity* rather than any worthy cause; meaning that they related to *ceremonies* rather than to any essential point of doctrine.

Another most important question was demanded of the laity: Whether the churches, pulpits, and other necessaries appertaining to the same, were *sufficiently repaired.* The churches indeed had been greatly profaned. [3] Horses and mules had been brought into them, as into a stable or common inn. The bells and other ornaments had been embezzled. A letter from the Council to the archbishop, previously to his visitation, declared the highest displeasure of the sovereign at this sacrilege; and [4] imprisonment also had now been denounced against those who might con-

[1] Art. of Vis. ut supr.
[2] Wheatly, 27.
[3] Strype.
[4] Ibid.

tinue to use irreverently the places of divine worship.

The marriage of the clergy, as we have seen, had occasioned the indignation of the Romanists; and they kept up as yet the popular clamour against it. Cranmer, desirous to remove the unjust prejudice, at the close of his articles accordingly asked the laity, "[1] whether any contemned married priests; and, because they were married, would not receive the sacrament at their hands."

[1] Art. of Vis. ut supr.

CHAPTER III.

1548.

The first Primer in the reign of Edward—The Catechism, usually called Cranmer's Catechism—Translated from the Latin of Justus Jonas, the elder, as the Latin is from various German treatises—Mistakes relating to it—Other Catechisms, separate, and in our Liturgy.

THE next religious formulary of the present reign was an excellent manual of prayers for private use, suitable to all sorts and conditions of men, bearing the old title of the Primer; and was first published at the close of 1547. In the next year followed a "Catechism, or Short Instruction into Christian Religion for the singular commodity and profit of children and young people;" which is usually denominated CRANMER'S CATECHISM. It is a translation from a Latin work, which was itself a translation from the German, by Justus Jonas, the father of him of the same names at this time resident in Lambeth Palace. The younger Justus Jonas, and [1] three other distinguished persons among the Reformers, who had fled from Germany early in 1548, rather than comply with the tem-

[1] Gualter, Dryander, and Eusebius Menius.

porary rule of faith and worship, entitled the [1] Interim, which the emperor resolved to enforce by the sword, brought with them from Melancthon recommendatory letters to Cranmer, by whom they were now courteously received and hospitably entertained. The elder Jonas was the friend of Melancthon; and Melancthon probably thought that the translation of the Catechism would be a proper accompaniment to the epistle, which was to introduce the son of his friend to the archbishop. Or perhaps Osiander might have sent the volume to the primate, as Gardiner [2] seems by naming him to insinuate. Certain it is that the attention of Cranmer, in the [3] year in which he received the refugees, was earnestly turned to this book. Strype and many others, down to the present time, represent the younger Jonas as the Latin translator. With the regius [4] professor of divinity at Oxford, who, in his interesting preface to a new edition of the English translation in 1829, conjectures the elder to have been the translator, I am proud to agree. I may add to his reasons for this belief, that in 1525 the

[1] There is a letter from the younger Jonas to secretary Cecil concerning the miseries of Germany, occasioned by the Interim; in which he solicits to partake of the king's munificence. Strype, Life of Cranm. Append. No. xcii.

[2] "Justus Jonas hath translated a Catechism out of Dutch [German] into Latin, taught in the city of Nuremberg, where Osiander is chief preacher, &c." Gardiner's Explication in answer to Cranmer, &c. 1551, fol. 5. b.

[3] Strype and others mistakingly assign it to the year 1547.

[4] Dr. Edward Burton.

[1] elder Jonas had been directed by Luther to prepare a catechism for young persons; and that in 1527 he is believed to have published such a form of instruction in his own language. But the Latin work, now before us, was not produced till the year [2] 1539. Of the German original, however, the learned professor has observed that no copy has as yet been discovered. But while he has overpassed a real guide to discovery, he nearly approaches it by conjecture. This Latin catechism is a [3] collection of addresses from a minister, not indeed in the usual catechetical manner, to the younger members of his flock. These addresses are drawn, it seems, from other elementary instructions with which Germany then abounded, and from regulations which for the use of his own territories and of Nuremberg the marquis of Brandenburg had before published.

The English translation appeared, before the close of 1548, with a dedication by the archbishop to the king, in which he pays a grateful tribute to the memory of Henry, complains of negligence in

[1] Bibliotheca Symbolica Evangelica Lutherana quam collegit J. W. Feverlinus, Gottingæ, 1752, inter Catechismos, p. 372.

[2] Published at Wittemberg. Bib. Symb. ut supr. p. 260.

[3] After the title of the Latin catechism is copied, the following note is appended to it. "Sunt conciones illæ Catecheticæ, quæ in libris Symbolicis Noribergensibus, et ante hos in Ordinationibus Eccl. Brandeburgo-Noribergensi aliisque Germanicæ extiterant." Bib. Symb. ut supr. p. 260.

the education of youth, and that the "ancient and laudable ceremony of confirmation" had been improperly administered. [1] Two printers were employed upon the impression. The title professes no more than that by the archbishop, the book was *set forth, overseen,* and *corrected.* "[2] My lord of Canterbury," said Dr. Rowland Taylor who had been his chaplain, "made a Catechism to be translated into English; which book was not of his own making; yet he set it forth in his own name; and truly that book for the time did much good." Gardiner, however, questioned his assertion as to the translator, and afterwards referred to Cranmer's own words in his Defence of the Sacrament, "in which work he confesses," said Gardiner, "the translation of the Catechism, *which,* one in communication would needs have me believe, *had been his man's doing, and not his.*" Hence perhaps the mistake of Foxe, which has

[1] "There were two printers of my said book." Cranmer's words related by Foxe. Lynne, who printed other books for the archbishop, employed his own press, and that of Nicholas Hyll also, on the present occasion. A copy is in the Cracherode collection, British Museum, with Gualterus Lynne excudebat, 1548. Hyll's impression is with the notice of being printed "for Lynne," but without the date. In like manner two printers were employed to print the Articles of 1552, whose copies of the same edition accordingly exhibit certain verbal variations.

[2] Foxe.

been [1] followed by others, in representing Ridley as having been employed to this purpose; the martyrologist referring to the Catechism what belongs to the Defence of the Sacrament in the conference between Ridley, secretary Bourne, and others, in the Tower. Bourne was weak enough to believe what the [2] enemies of Cranmer now insinuated, that the Defence was not written by the archbishop's pen.—" [3] How can you make but a figure or a sign of the sacrament, as that book [does] which is set forth in my lord of Canterbury's name?" was the question proposed to Ridley by Bourne, who added, " I wis, you can tell who made it: *Did not you make it?*"—" Here was much murmuring of the rest, as though they would have given me," says Ridley, " the glory of

[1] He places in the margin of Ridley's conference in his martyrology, " The Catechism." The learned author of the Life of Alexander Nowell, p. 154, (Oxf. 1809,) is thus misled by Foxe.

[2] Among the witnesses, in the last proceedings at Oxford against the archbishop, there was one, and but one, prompted perhaps by the scurrilous proctor Martin, who affected to consider Cranmer as not able to have composed the Defence, or any of the works ascribed to him: " credit prefatum Thomam *vix adeò eruditum* ut possit ipse ejus proprio ingenio hujusmodi libros componere!" This person was Robert Ward, of Merton College, a violent Romanist, who in 1554 was one of the disputants with Ridley at Oxford upon transubstantiation. We shall presently find Martin idly attempting in like manner to depreciate the learning of the archbishop.

[3] Foxe.

writing that book; which yet was said, of some there, to contain the most heinous heresy that ever was." The Catechism would not thus be designated: by a Romanist the Defence would certainly be so. "Master secretary," Ridley replied, "that book was made of a great learned man, and one who is able to do the like again: as for me, I assure you, I was never able to do or write any such like thing; he passeth me no less than the learned master his young scholar." Such was the ingenuous reference of Ridley to Cranmer, and the hearers evidently submitted to the application. But to return to the Catechism: With Strype we may certainly conclude that "it was by the archbishop himself, or his special order, turned into English; and, to fix an authority to the same, he caused it to be published in his own name, and owned it for his own book." No doubt, he revised it; and introduced into it observations which are not in the Latin original. The style and the matter, where the interpolations occur, certainly indicate his hand.

The work consists of expositions of the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the authority of the keys, and the Lord's Supper.

The Commandments are indeed arranged as they are in the Romish ritual, the first and second apparently forming only one, and the tenth being divided into two. A spirited discourse against idolatry, of which there is no trace in the Latin

translation, is introduced into the exposition of the *first* Commandment, which however it effectually divides. For after stating the words "Thou shalt make thee no graven *image, nor any likeness of any thing which is in heaven above, or in earth beneath, or in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down unto it, nor worship it;*" the discourse thus proceeds. "These words by most interpreters of late time [Cranmer here means the Romanists] belong to the first Commandment, *although after the interpretation of many ancient authors they be the* SECOND *Commandment;* in which words it is to be noted, that it is not without great cause, that God with so plain and express words doth forbid worshipping of images. For He saw that man's corrupt nature, from the first time that he fell from God, hath ever been inclined and ready to idolatry, and to bow down to creatures, rather than to look up to God that made him. Wherefore He inhibiteth all occasions of the same. God did also foresee, that in the latter days men should come which would maintain worshipping of images, not only with painted colours, but also with painted words, saying, We kneel not to the image, but before the image; we worship not the image, but the thing which is represented by the image; we worship not the creatures, but the Creator in the creatures. And such like excuses the greatest idolaters did always pretend. But to the intent

they should not so deceive you, God doth oftentimes in Holy Scripture call upon you, saying, Thou shalt not make to thee any graven image or likeness of any creature; thou shalt not kneel nor bow thyself down to it.—I will declare unto you the images that have been so abused: the which abuses, good children, your own fathers, if you ask them, can well declare unto you. For they themselves were greatly seduced by certain famous and notorious images, as by our [1] lady of Walsingham, our lady of Ipswich, St. Thomas of Canterbury, St. Anne of Buxton, the rood of grace, and such like; whom many of your parents visited yearly, leaving their own houses and families. To them they made vows and pilgrimages, thinking that God would hear their prayers in that place rather than another place. They kissed their feet devoutly, and to them they offered candles and images of wax, rings, beads, gold, and silver, abundantly. And because they that so taught them had thereby great commodity, they maintained the same with feigned miracles and erroneous doctrine, teaching the people that God would hear their prayers made before this image, rather than before another image, or in another place, whereas the prophet Isaiah saith,

[1] "So were we wont to say, Our lady of Walsingham, our lady of Ipswich, &c. not meaning the things themselves, but calling their *images* by the name of the things by them represented." Cranmer, Def. against Gardiner, 2d edit. 267.

that God doth hear those that are penitent in every place alike."

After this statement, it may excite the surprise of an attentive reader to find it elsewhere said of the archbishop, that, "[1] leaning in this Catechism more than usually to the ancient doctrines, *he comprises the prohibition of false gods and of images under one commandment!*" The learned historian, who has been thus eager to misrepresent the man, could surely never have fairly opened the book.

The perspicuous exposition of the Creed, which follows that of the Commandments, is without addition in the English translation.

But in the discourse upon the Lord's Prayer the hand of Cranmer again is visible, at the conclusion of the preface to it, (which exists not in the Latin,) where he eloquently says, "Wherefore, good children, forasmuch as God hath commanded us to resort to Him boldly, and to moan ourselves to Him in all our troubles and adversities, and hath promised that He will hear our prayers, deliver us, and grant us all things necessary for our salvation, let us not refuse this honour that we be called unto, let us not refuse this remedy, help, aid, and succour, that is freely offered of our most merciful Father to all his children that will call upon His Name. For this

[1] Lingard, Hist. Eng. 8vo. vii. 37.

is a sacrifice most acceptable to God, wherewith He is most highly honoured and pleased. Wherefore, good children, both daily and hourly accustom yourselves, even from your tender age, to pray to your Heavenly Father for all things necessary. Offer up unto Him at your uprising and downlying, before your meals, and after your meat, this sacrifice of your lips, the oblation of praise and thanksgiving; worship Him at all times with the frankincense of THIS PRAYER taught unto you by our Saviour Christ; the perfume whereof, if it be cast into the burning coals of faith and charity, it pierceth the clouds, and is so sweet and pleasant unto God, that it vanisheth not away, until it have obtained that thing that it was sent for. For it is written, that the prayer of a just man can do much with God, and the eyes of the Lord do look upon the righteous, and his ears be opened to hear their prayers."

The Latin Catechism proceeds with an explanation of the three sacraments maintained by the Lutheran divines, Baptism, The power of the keys, and The Lord's Supper. In the first and second discourses the translation follows the original very closely. In the last there is a remarkable variation between them, which strengthens the opinion I have [1] already expressed, that Cranmer at no time entertained the Lutheran doctrine of

[1] See before, vol. i. p. 265.

consubstantiation. It is this. Where the Latin Catechism speaks of the body and blood of Christ being [1] *present* in the sacrament, the English speaks only of our [2] *receiving* them. The archbishop, however, after he had published his Defence of the Sacrament in 1550, was [3] charged by bishop Gardiner with gross contradictions upon this subject in the Catechism, as well by a declaration as by a picture. "A book," said the accuser, "set forth in the archbishop of Canterbury's name, called a Catechism, willeth children to be taught that they receive with their bodily mouth the body and blood of Christ." Cranmer replied, "[4] In a Catechism by me translated and set forth I used [this] manner of speech, that with our bodily mouths *we receive the body and blood of Christ.* Which my saying divers ignorant persons, (not used to read old ancient authors, nor acquainted with their phrase and manner of speech,) did carp, and reprehend, for lack of good understanding. For this speech and others before rehearsed of Chrysostome, and all other like, are not understood of *the very flesh and blood of our Saviour Christ,* (which, indeed, we neither feel

[1] "Quod verè corpus et sanguis ejus *sit.*" Lat. Catech. Dr. Burton, Pref. to the Oxf. edit. 1829, pp. xviii, xxii.

[2] "We *receive* truly the body and blood of Christ." Eng. Catech. Dr. Burton, ut supr.

[3] Strype.

[4] Answ. to Gardiner, 2d edit. 267.

nor see,) but that which we do to the bread and wine, *by a figurative speech* is spoken to be done to the flesh and blood, because they are the very signs, figures, and tokens, instituted of Christ, to represent unto us his very flesh and blood. And yet as with our corporal eyes, corporal hands and mouths, we do corporally see, feel, taste, and eat the bread and drink the wine, (being the sign and sacraments of Christ's body,) even so with our spiritual eyes, hands, and mouths, we do spiritually see, feel, taste, and eat his very flesh, and drink his very blood."—Gardiner replies in anger to the archbishop, "[1] that *the original of his translated Catechism* confutes him in few words, being printed in Germany, wherein, besides the matter written, is set forth in picture the manner of the ministring of this sacrament, where is the altar with candle-light set forth, the priest apparelled after the old sort, and the man to receive kneeling, barehead, and holding up his hands, while the priest ministers the host to his mouth; a matter as clear contrary to the matter of this book, as is light and darkness." The archbishop answers, with an admirable retort, "[2] it may appear to them that have any judgment what pithy arguments you make, and what dexterity you have in gathering of authors' minds, that would gather my mind, and make an argument

[1] Answ. to Gardiner, 2d edit. 268.

[2] Ibid. 269.

here of a picture, neither put in my book, nor by me devised, but invented by some fond painter or carver, who paint and grave whatsoever their idle heads can fancy! You should rather have gathered your argument upon the other side; *that I mislike the matter, because I left out of my book the picture that was in the original before.* And I marvel you are not ashamed to allege so vain a matter against me, which indeed is not in my book; and if it were, yet were it nothing to the purpose. *And in that Catechism I teach not, as you do, that the body and blood of Christ is contained in the sacrament being reserved, but that in the ministration thereof we receive the body and blood of Christ, whereunto if it may please you to add, or understand, this word* [1] SPIRITUALLY, *then is the doctrine of my Catechism sound and good in all men's ears, who know the true doctrine of the sacraments.*"

Such too was his answer to Dr. Richard Smith,

[1] This assertion of Cranmer is more powerfully enforced by him in his Preface to the Defence of the Lord's Supper, which is repeated in his Defence against Gardiner, where he says that his meaning "of the body of Christ being present with them that worthily receive the sacrament, is, that the *force*, the *grace*, the *virtue*, and *benefit* of Christ's body that was crucified for us, be really and effectually present with all them that duly receive the sacraments; but all this is to be understood of his *spiritual* presence." The Catechism before us distinguishes also this "eating and drinking the body and blood of Christ *spiritually*."

who had also written against his Defence of the Sacrament; "who reporteth untruly of me," says the archbishop, "that I in my book of the Catechism did set forth the real presence of Christ's body in the sacrament. Unto which false report I have answered in my fourth book, the eighth chapter." With his accustomed ingenuousness he then says, "but this I confess of myself, that, [1] *not long before* I wrote the said Catechism, I was in that error of the real presence, as I was many years past in divers other errors, as of transubstantiation, of the sacrifice propitiatory of the priests in the mass, of pilgrimages, purgatory, pardons, and many other superstitions and errors that came from Rome."

To this Catechism the enemies of Cranmer, when he was in their power, referred with a pretence, as base as it was vain, of shewing in its pages that, to maintain a point, he had falsified an important passage in a second impression of the book. Martin, the proctor of Mary, in the last proceedings against him at Oxford, thus preferred the accusation.

"[2] Martin. When king Henry died, did you not translate Justus Jonas's book?

"Cranmer. I did so.

[1] He therefore admits that *before* the Catechism was translated into English, he had relinquished the error of the real presence. See also before, vol. i. p. 266.

[2] Foxe.

"Martin. Then there you defended another doctrine touching the sacraments, by the same token that you sent to Lynne your printer, that whereas in the first print there was an affirmative, that is to say, Christ's body *really* in the sacrament, you sent then to your printer to put in a *not*, whereby it came miraculously to pass that Christ's body was clean conveyed out of the sacrament.

"Cranmer. I remember there were two printers of my said book, but where the same *not* was put in, I cannot tell."

Of such dishonesty the archbishop was unconscious. If indeed there had been such an insertion, it must have been made without his knowledge. But "[1] if the reader will look to all the places in the discourse on the Lord's Supper in the Catechism, which appear to favour the doctrine of the real presence, he will find it almost impossible for the word *not* to have been inserted." Nor is the word [2] *really* to be found throughout the whole of it. In vain also is the [3] copy, which a second printer furnished, examined in support

[1] Dr. Burton, ut supr. Pref. p. xxiv.

[2] Ibid.

[3] In consequence of two printers being employed at the same time upon the work, as Cranmer admits. A list of errata is not found in all the copies; but some desire the word *not* to be inserted after *is*, in the following passage, which has no reference to the disputed point before us: "the name of God is hallowed also, &c." See Dr. Burton, ut supr. p. xxiv.

of Martin's charge, which therefore we may conclude, especially when we consider the character of the accuser, as altogether unfounded. Strype has unadvisedly said indeed, " that in a second edition of the Catechism the word *not* was inserted in a certain place of the book to alter the doctrine of the real presence, which was asserted in the first edition." Ere he thus proceeded to stain the memory of Cranmer, he ought to have cited the *certain place*, he ought to have minutely described the *peccant edition;* neither of which, however, it was in his power to do. It has been pleaded[1] for him that he was misled by the dialogue, which has been cited, between the archbishop and Martin. It has been suggested also, that Martin himself remembering a passage in the Answer of Gardiner to Cranmer's Defence, where the version of a sentence by Cranmer from Theodoret is thus challenged, " I ween the printer left out a *not*, and should have said, not changed into the godly substance," confounded the Catechism with the Defence. But Martin was a man ready to advance any charge against the archbishop that might please Gardiner. He was one, said bishop Ponet, " who could put off all shame, and put on all impudence." He could dare to assert that Cranmer's Answer to Gardiner, one of the noblest pieces of controversial theology that

[1] By Dr. Burton.

ever was penned, was merely replying, "[1] *our Lord knoweth how,* to my lord of Winchester;" that perhaps "some other in the archbishop's name was the author of it;" that "he was loth to think it all to be his, and therefore (said he) when I name the bishop of Canterbury, I mean the maker and author of his book!" Before I quit this vindication of Cranmer, let me gratify the reader with his triumph over the charge of Gardiner's *not,* as we have already found him triumphing over that of Martin. "[2] Where you say that I by oversight, or the printer by negligence, have left out a *not,* if I should have put in that *not* of mine own head contrary to the original in Greek, and to all the translators in Latin, and the translator of Peter Martyr also, I should have been as far overseen as you be, *who, as it seemeth of purpose, confound and corrupt you care not whether any authors' words, or their meaning.*"

Of this Catechism, which has occasioned so much illustration, several erroneous descriptions have been given. Burnet,[3] summing up the character of it, observes that hence it will appear that, from the beginning of our Reformation, the practice in the Church of Rome in regard to images was held idolatrous; that Cranmer was zealous

[1] See his Treatise of Priests' Unlawful Marriages, 1554, sign. F. ij.

[2] Def. against Gardiner, 2d ed.

[3] Hist. Ref. P. II. B. i.

for restoring the penitentiary canons; and that he had laid aside those singular opinions, which he had formerly expressed of the ecclesiastical functions; "for now, in *a work which was wholly his own, without the concurrence of any others,* he fully sets forth their divine institution." Misled perhaps by the authority of Burnet, archbishop Wake seems to have [1] considered this translated Catechism "as drawn up by Cranmer himself." Strype has confounded it, by saying that it was reprinted towards the end of Edward's reign, with the Short Catechism for all schoolmasters to teach, which was published in 1553, a few days only before the decease of the young king. In a recent Life of Cranmer, the Nuremberg formulary also has been mistakenly eulogized as the purer Catechism which now adorns our Liturgy.

But the translated Catechism soon gave place to a native English one, which was probably ordered by Cranmer. It was inserted into the first Liturgy of Edward, (1549), in the office of Confirmation, and continued in the second. With our present Church-Catechism it agreed almost word for word, as far as it went, which was to the explanation of the Lord's Prayer. Every sixth week at the least the curate of each parish was enjoined to teach it. The same excellent method of instruction was soon adopted,

[1] Brief Comm. upon the Church Catechism, 3d edit. Dedication.

by those who favoured the Reformation, in Scotland. In January 1551-2, it was agreed at a provincial meeting of the clergy in Edinburgh, that a Catechism, containing an explanation of the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the Creed, as "[1] ane commone and catholick instruction" for the people, should be published, and by the ministers be diligently taught. Immediately after the publication of our Articles of Religion in 1553, the Short Catechism, already mentioned, was printed in English as well as Latin; although archbishop [2] Wake speaks of it as being only in the latter language; and the Articles were subjoined to it. It has been by some ascribed to Ponet, or Poinet, afterwards bishop of Rochester and finally of Winchester; by others to Nowell, dean of St. Paul's. Ridley was also charged as the compiler of it, but [3] un-

[1] Ames, Hist. of Printing, 578.

[2] Comm. on the Ch. Catechism, 3d edit. Dedication. Strype, in his Life of Cranmer, B. 2. ch. 34, commits the same mistake, but in his Ecclesiastical Memorials, ii. 368, admits the Latin impression.

[3] Ridley was charged to be the author and publisher of it by Ward and Weston, in their disputation with him at Oxford; who *falsely told him that Cranmer had said so.* Ridley told him that he was not, and that Cranmer would not say so: but he confessed that he saw the book, perused it after it was made, noted many things in it, and so at the synod of the clergy consented to it. Strype, Ecc. Mem. ii. 368.

justly. But "[1] whoever was the author, the archbishop we may conclude to be the furtherer and recommender of it to the king; it being Cranmer's great design by Catechisms, and Articles of Religion, and plain Expositions of fundamental truths, to instil right principles into the minds of the youth, and common people, for the more effectual rooting out of popery that had been so long entertained by the industrious nursling up the nation in ignorance." Cranmer indeed, publicly[2] owned in his answers to the commissioners of Mary, in the last proceedings against him at Oxford, that it was begun by his advice and digested under his inspection. Some of the witnesses against him, in these proceedings,[3] testified the same. Of this Catechism the very learned and excellent archbishop Wake has again spoken not very accurately, it has been[4] observed, when

[1] Life of Cranm. B. 2. ch. 34. But Strype positively asserts Nowell to be the author of it, Ecc. Mem. ii. 368. The learned biographer of Nowell, (archdeacon Churton,) in 1809, seems to consider Poinet as entitled to the authorship of *this* Catechism, from which Nowell at a later period adopted parts in *his* Catechism. Life of Nowell, 403-407.

[2] "Quoad Catechismum et Articulos in eodem fatetur se adhibuisse ejus concilium circa editionem ejusdem," &c. Proc. Lambeth MSS. ut supr. No. 1136.

[3] Dr. Tresham and Dr. Smith, canons of Christ-Church, Oxford; Dr. Marshall, dean of the same; Curtop, dean of Peterborough, and others. Proc. ut supr.

[4] Churton, Life of Alex. Nowell, p. 157. See the Abp's Pref. to his Commentary on the Church-Catechism.

he says, "Here I take the complete model of our Church Catechism to have been first laid: to the explication of the Creed, the Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer, was *added* a short account of the two sacraments." [1] The sacraments do not, as is here implied, constitute a separate and the last part of the work; but are introduced, under the ninth article of the Creed, as some of the external parts of religion, or *cultus Dei;* and the mode of administration and design of them are delivered, chiefly in the words of Scripture, but not their appropriate nature, as outward signs of inward grace. The Catechism, as it now stands in our Liturgy, received not the present explanation of the sacraments [2] till the reign of James the First.

[1] Churton, 158.

[2] Wheatly. See also the Hampton Court Conference, 1603, p. 44. "Dr. Reinolds complained that the Catechism in the Common Prayer Book was too brief, for which one by Nowell, late dean of St. Paul's was added, and that too long for young novices to learn by heart: he requested therefore that one uniform Catechism might be made, which, and none other, might be generally received: It was demanded of him, whether, if to the short Catechism in the Communion-Book *something were added for the doctrine of the sacraments*, it would not serve? His Majesty thought the doctor's request very reasonable; but yet so that he would have a Catechism in the fewest and plainest affirmative terms that may be." This was accordingly done by bishop Overal, then dean of St. Paul's, and approved by the bishops.

CHAPTER IV.

1548 to 1549.

The first Common Prayer Book in Edward the Sixth's reign—Opposed by the rebels in Devonshire—Cranmer undertakes to convince them of their folly.

THE Catechism of 1548 was the precursor of a greater work, the first service-book of Edward the sixth. Cranmer, who had presided at the committee of prelates and divines by whom the Order for the Communion was formed, was now the chief director of [1] twelve of those learned and pious men to whom we owe this Liturgy. Of the distinct parts supplied by each no evidence

[1] These were Goodrich, bishop of Ely, Skyp, of Hereford, Thirlby, of Westminster, Day, of Chichester, Holbeach, of Lincoln, Ridley, of Rochester; Dr. May, dean of St. Paul's, Dr. Taylor, dean of Lincoln, Dr. Haynes, dean of Exeter, Dr. Redmayn, dean of Westminster, Dr. Cox, almoner to the king, and Dr. Robertson, archdeacon of Leicester.—In the former committee were also the archbishop of York, the bishops of Durham, Worcester, Norwich, St. Asaph, Lichfield, Salisbury, Carlisle, Bristol, and St. David's.

has descended to us. But by the care and direction [1] principally of Cranmer the work was finished, [2] passed in convocation, and [3] confirmed though not without opposition in parliament. Burnet says that the bishops of Norwich, Hereford, Chichester, and Westminster, protested against it, although employed in the production of it. But the bishop of Norwich was not one of the compilers. From the entire compilation, however, these prelates dissented, only because with some [4] few particulars of it they were dissatisfied. Four other prelates, but not of the committee which composed the book, as a [5] late historian has asserted, also voted against it. These were Bonner, Tunstal, Aldrich, and Heath, whose prejudices in favour of the old superstitions were now not to be removed. By others of their opinion the service, as might be expected, was much censured; by multitudes, however, on the other hand, it was received with approbation,

[1] "The book was probably compiled by only a few of the commissioners, discussed and assented to by others." Ridley, 223. Besides Cranmer, perhaps Goodrich and Ridley were the principal compilers. The two admirable summaries of our duty to God and to our neighbour, which are in the Catechism, and are inscribed on a part of the episcopal palace at Ely by Goodrich, are supposed to have been drawn up by that prelate. See Churton's Life of Nowell, 155.

[2] November 24, 1548.

[3] January 15, 1548-9.

[4] Burnet.

[5] Lingard, 8vo. vii. 39.

joy, and thankfulness. But an especial cavil against the Act for the uniformity of divine service, which now gave the book to the public, was raised, on account of the assertion in it, that the book was framed "by the aid of the Holy Ghost." The expression was maintained as just. It was to be [1] understood not as if the compilers had been inspired by extraordinary assistance, for then there had been no room for any correction of what was now done; but in the sense of every good motion and consultation being directed, or assisted, by the secret influences of divine grace, which even in their imperfect actions often help the virtuous. While [2] Romanists, down to the present day, appear to censure this expression, they are silent as to the confident declaration of one whom they often exalt to undue respect, bishop Stephen Gardiner; who, writing to the vice-chancellor of Cambridge a few days before the publication of the Necessary Erudition, said, that "[3] the king's Majesty, *by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost,* hath componed all matters of religion."

The first care for the new service was, that the

[1] Burnet. Ridley, in like manner, defends it. Life of Ridley, 249.

[2] Bossuet, Hist. des Variat. vii. 343. Dodd, Church Hist. Milner, End of Religious Controversy, Lett. 43. Lingard, Hist. Eng. 8vo. vii. 39, 119.

[3] Strype, Ecc. Mem. i. 328. This letter of Gardiner is also given in Ellis's second series of original letters, ii. 209.

whole of it should be in English; as a completion of what the Primer at the close of Henry's reign had begun, that is, "[1] a form of public prayer in the mother-tongue." The service [2] commenced, at morning and evening, with the Lord's Prayer; the previous exhortation, confession, and absolution, which we now have, not being as yet supplied. The Psalms were regulated as in the present daily order; the Lessons, with a little variation from the directions now belonging to them. After the first Lesson the noble hymn *Te Deum* followed; after the second, the *Benedictus*. The Apostles' Creed, which formerly was wont to be whispered by the officiating priest alone, was then to be publicly recited. Suffrages, translated from the Latin breviary, were the next in order, followed by Collects, adopted from similar ancient forms, in most of which the [3] superiority in the language of our Liturgy is indeed very striking. The Communion service, which contained almost all that had been directed in the office of the preceding year, together with large additions, then presents itself; but the [4] absolution in it no longer began with proclaim-

[1] See before, vol. 1. 373.

[2] Heylin. Burnet. Collier. Ridley.

[3] Archbishop Laurence has given some forcible proofs of this in the notes to his Bampton Lectures.

[4] See the form itself. Collier has reprinted it, Ecc. Hist. ii. Records, No. 59. The precatory absolution is precisely the same as in our present communion-service. Ibid. p. 69.

ing the power of the keys; it was then, as it is now, only precatory. After this service came the Litany; then the office of Baptism, in which, and in the subsequent ones of Confirmation, Matrimony, Visiting the Sick, Burial, and Churching, there were ceremonies at that time to be observed, which have been since abolished. To ceremonies the people had long been accustomed. Reasons were therefore given, which still keep their place at the beginning of our Common Prayer Book, "Why some are abolished, and some retained." In the Act a provision was added, authorizing the singing of psalms "at any time." Whether this provision now introduced into the service English versions of the Psalms in metre, is uncertain. But as in 1549 a portion of the Psalms thus translated by Sternhold was published, and by him dedicated to Edward, it leads us to suppose that they were admitted. The same year indeed was fertile of these metrical versions. By Wyatt, Coverdale, and Crowley, such at that time were published: before it the pen of the accomplished Surrey had been thus employed.

It has been sometimes said that the labour of our Reformers, in this liturgical production, was but small. In answer to those who have thus unjustly depreciated it, Dr. Ridley has replied, that they who represent them as doing little, may observe ten material differences of the Re-

formed Common Prayer as it was now framed, and soon afterwards, revised from the Romish. [1] I. The service in the language which the people know. II. Scripture lessons instead of legends. III. The Scriptures orderly read through, instead of a broken and interrupted course. IV. The Creed more properly disposed. V. The Lord's Prayer, more agreeable to Christ's appointment, before reading and prayer. VI. Repeated aloud, instead of secretly. VII. The Ave Mary and commemoration of the Virgin omitted. VIII. The monkish metrical hymns rejected. IX. As also prayers for the dead. X. And addresses to saints, together with the superstitious consecrating and exorcising salt, water, bread, incense, candles, palms, leaves of flowers, grapes, fire, bells, images, altars, crosses, vessels, and garments.

Our service-book has been accordingly pronounced "[2] a compilation of ancient forms, selected with prudence, corrected with judgment, and arranged with simplicity." The copy of the first impression of it, [3] printed by Grafton in March 1548-9, Cranmer then presented to Edward. It was reprinted in the following June, if not also before

[1] Life of Ridley. 233.

[2] Abp. Laurence, Bampt. Lect. 197.

[3] Ames. Herbert. The price of the book unbound, which is a folio, was "straitly charged" to be no more than two shillings and twopence; bound in forel (a kind of parchment) to be not above two shillings and tenpence; in sheepskin to be at three shillings and fourpence; and in calfskin at four shillings.

that time. In these distinct copies some verbal variations, or arrangements, of the contents, which however are unimportant, [1] have been found. Almost immediately after the publication of it, a [2] proclamation was made for the mass to be put down throughout the whole realm; although in the contents of the book the words, "[3] commonly called the mass," as yet had not been removed from the title of the Lord's Supper. But Cranmer had removed it, in his [4] manuscript remarks, from the king's Injunctions. What Jewell afterwards eloquently observed to his Romish opponent, was now effected. "[5] The mass of itself fell down, and fled away before the holy communion, even as the darkness before the light, and as the idol Dagon fell down at the presence of the ark of the God of Israel."

The new service-book was directed to come into general use on the Whitsunday of 1549. But by many of the clergy, who had received it immediately after its publication, it began to be used at Easter; and with the liveliest satisfaction congregations now attended to intelligible devotions in the vernacular language. In appearance

[1] Dr. Dibdin says, "it is rarely that three copies are found alike." Typograph. Antiq. iii. 464.

[2] April 6. Stow, 1005.

[3] Grafton's Edit. March, 1549.

[4] Strype, Ecc. Mem. ii. 46.

[5] Bishop Jewell's Reply to Hardinge, &c. 1565, p. 481.

nearly the whole clergy conformed to it. But some there were who waited only for an opportunity to express, and to instigate, resistance to it. Among these we shall presently find the worthless Bonner, who was slow to disperse the book, and to enjoin the use of it, throughout his diocese. He was watching the issue of the commotions that soon were raised in several parts of the kingdom. To the influence of refractory priests one of the greatest of these commotions is ascribed. After the first reading of this liturgy in the church of Sampford Courtney, in Devonshire, some of the parishioners insisted that on the [1] following day the rector should use, as in former times, the Latin mass. To this apparent compulsion the parish-priest himself is [2] supposed to have invited them. Discontented because of inclosures that were made of what was once monastic property, insurgents indeed were now shewing themselves in other parts as well as the west of England. The insurrection of the men of Devonshire and Cornwall, however, which began under the pretence of throwing open the inclosures, was soon [3] found to have been chiefly raised in maintenance of the old religion, and in especial hostility to the new liturgy. Their own proposals to the government exemplify this. Sanders himself admits it. In great numbers under

[1] Whitmonday, June 10.

[2] Heylin, 75.

[3] Ibid.

the command of a gentleman of Cornwall, and under the encouragement of Romish priests, they besieged but were unable to take the city of Exeter. The commotion might at first have been easily crushed. But the timidity and indecision of government served to increase it. Some of the [1] proclamations by the Protector, in opposition to the Council, as they regarded the inclosures, are believed to have encouraged the rebellion. If instead of furnishing the lord Russel, who was sent against them, with proclamations, the government had supplied him with a force sufficient to awe a rude and misguided multitude, forty days and more would not have elapsed ere a close, less sanguinary than it really proved, was brought to this rebellion. To convince these defeated insurgents of their errors, Cranmer now undertook to answer at large the preposterous demands which they had vainly expected to be granted. This master-piece of reasoning, as the work has rightly been [2] called, while it exhibits consummate judgment, as well as a perfect [3] knowledge of the manners of the lower people, exhibits also a large extent of learning. But its greatest recommendation is, that, " [4] in a narrow compass, it contains most of

[1] Heylin, 75.
[2] Brit. Crit. Jan. 1830. p. 57.
[3] Gilpin, 141.
[4] Brit. Crit. ut supr.

the leading arguments which have since been expanded, and variously diversified, by later divines; and may be considered as THE VERY ESSENCE OF PROTESTANTISM." Concurring with the learned writer of this remark, I have thought it due to the memory of the archbishop, and to the religious establishment of our country, to copy into these pages the whole of the answers. Admirably adapted as they are to the capacity of those to whom they are addressed, and therefore to all ranks of men, they may be a welcome novelty to many, who are unacquainted with the work in which they first appeared. Dr. Lingard has bestowed upon them the title of [1] elaborate; but, at the same time, in order to depreciate them, he observes, " [2] that one of the [rebels'] articles seems to have embarrassed the archbishop. The Cornish men complained that they did not understand the English service; he replied, that they did not understand the Latin. But this was an evasion. Certainly on the same principle, on which he contended that the English ought to have an English liturgy, the Irish, Welsh, and Cornish had a right to a service in their own languages." All this is adopted by Dr. Lingard from Sanders. However, if the Cornish men had made such a demand, and the archbishop had denied the pro-

[1] Hist. of Eng. 8vo. viii. 61. [2] Ibid.

priety of it, the censure would have been just. But they ask only for the Latin service; "the mass *in Latin*, without any man or woman communicating." Again, "we will not receive the new service," say they, "because it is but like a Christmas game; but we will have the old service of matins, mass, even-song, and processions *in Latin*, as it was before: and so we, the Cornish men, whereof *certain of us* understand no English, utterly refuse this new English." How can Cranmer be said to be "*embarrassed*," or where is "*evasion*" when his answer to their third article evidently implies, by the admission that various nations have the service in their own language, that to the Cornish he would have given such a liturgy, if they had required it, and if it could have been then provided; and when his answer to their eighth article "[1] puts down not only the rebels, but their modern advocate also, where the words are, As concerning the having the service in the Latin tongue, it is sufficiently spoken of in the answer to the third article. But I would gladly know the reason why the Cornish men refuse utterly the *new English* as you call it, because *certain of you* understand it not; and yet you will have the service in *Latin* which almost *none of you* understand. If this be a sufficient cause for Cornwall to refuse the English service, because some of you

[1] Brit. Crit. ut supr. 59.

understand no English, a much greater cause have they both of Cornwall and Devonshire to refuse the late service, forasmuch as fewer of them know the Latin tongue than they of Cornwall the English tongue!"

The demands of the rebels, to which an ineffectual "[1] message was sent by the king's Majesty," were signed by Arundel, Underhill, Sloman, and Segar, who described themselves "[2] chief captaynes;" and by John Thompson, priest, Bray, mayor of Bodmin, Lee, mayor of Torrington, and Barret another priest, whose designation was that of "the four governours of the campes." Cranmer gave his answers in the following words.

[1] Ames, 207.

[2] Ibid.

CHAPTER V.

1549.

The Answers of the Archbishop to the fifteen Articles of the Devonshire rebels.

[1] WHEN I first read your requests, O ignorant men of Devonshire and Cornwall, straightway came to my mind a request, which James and John made unto Christ; to whom Christ answered, *You ask you wot not what.* Even so thought I of you as soon as ever I heard your Articles, that you were deceived by some crafty papist, which devised those Articles for you, to make you *ask you wist not what.*

As for the devisers of your Articles, if they understand them, I may not call them ignorant persons, but, as they be indeed, most rank papists, and wilful traitors and adversaries both to God and our sovereign lord the king, and to the whole realm. But I cannot be persuaded so to think of you, that in your hearts willingly you be papists and traitors; but that those that be

[1] From the MSS. C.C.C. Camb. Strype. Append. No. xl.

such have craftily seduced you, being simple and unlearned people, *to ask you wot not what.*

Wherefore my duty unto God, and the pity that I have of your ignorance, move me now at this time to open plainly and particularly your own Articles unto you, that you may understand them, and no longer be deceived.

In your first Article you require, that all the general councils and holy decrees of our forefathers may be observed and kept, and whosoever shall gainsay them to be holden as heretics.

This you all ask, but what you ask I dare say very few, or none of you understand. For how many of you, I pray you, do know certainly which be called the [1] general councils, and holy decrees of the Fathers, and what is in them contained? The holy decrees, as they call them, be nothing else but the laws and ordinances of the bishop of Rome. Whereof the most part be made for his own advancement, glory, and lucre; and to make him and his clergy governors of the whole world; and to be exempted from all princes' laws, and to do what they list. And would you ask, if you knew what you asked, that we should put away the laws of our own realm, and be governed by the bishop of Rome's laws? If you mean this, then be ye traitors to the king,

[1] See the archbishop's speech upon the subject of general councils, vol. i. p, 120, seq.

and enemies to your own realm. And if you mean it not, consider what persons they be, and how they have deceived you, that make you *ask you wot not what.*

And as for the general councils, you say you will have them all kept: but you be not so destitute of all reason, that you would have spoken such words, if you had known what you had said. For a greater number of councils repugn one against another. How should they then be all kept, when one is contrary to another, and the keeping of one is the breaking of another? And among your own Articles you say, you will have divers things observed, which be not only contrary to the general councils, but also contrary to the laws of this realm, and also to God's laws, as it shall be plainly declared, when we come to the Articles.

And all reason is contrary that you should have asked such things, if you had known what you had asked. I have this opinion of the greater number of you, that you would fain walk in the right way, if you could find it. And forasmuch as I perceive, that wicked and false guides, under pretence to bring you to the high way, have brought you clean out of it, my good will shall be, seeing you so far wandering out of the way, and so blind-folded with ill persuasions that you cannot see where you go, to open your eyes that you may see, and to set you again into the right

way. And when your eyes be so opened that you may see, and the right way be shewed unto you wherein you should walk; then if you will still wink, and not see, and run headlong into error, and not come to the right way, you may no longer be called simple and ignorant people, but perverse, froward, and wicked papists and traitors, enemies to God and your own realm.

But now I will come to your Articles, particularly opening every one of them by himself, that you may see the bowels thereof, and what is contained in the same; that when you shall understand the whole, you may judge whether you knew before what you asked, or you were deceived by subtil and wily papistical traitors.

I. Your First Article is this. *We will have all the general councils and holy decrees of our forefathers observed, kept, and performed: and whosoever shall gainsay them, we hold them as heretics.*

First, to begin with the manner of your phrase. Is this the fashion of subjects to speak unto their prince; *we will have?* Was this manner of speech at any time used of the subjects to their prince, since the beginning of the world? Have not all true subjects ever used to their sovereign lord this form of speaking, *Most humbly beseecheth your faithful and obedient subjects?* Although the papists have abused your ignorance in propounding such Articles, which you understand not, yet you should not have suffered yourselves so much

to be led by the nose, and bridled by them, that you should clearly forget your duty of allegiance unto your sovereign lord, saying unto him, *This we will have;* and saying that with armour upon your backs and swords in your hands. Would any of you, that be householders, be content, that your servants should come upon you with harness unto their backs, and swords in their hands, and say unto you, *This we will have?* If then you would abhor and detest this in your servants towards yourselves, how can you allow your fact? With what conscience can you, being but subjects, do to your king that thing, which you would condemn in your servants towards yourselves? But answer me this, Be you subjects or no? If you be subjects, then I admonish you, as St. Paul taught Titus, saying, "Warn them to be subject to princes, and rulers, obeying them at a word." But tell me again, Pertaineth this to subjection and obedience to say, *This we will have?* St. Peter saith, "Be subject unto kings, as unto chief heads, and to other rulers sent by them. For so is the will of God." God's will is, that you should be ruled by your princes. But whether this is to be ruled by your king, or to rule your king, to say, *Thus we will have the realm governed?* Your servants be by the Scripture commanded, as they fear God, to be obedient to their masters, whether their masters be good or evil. And can you think it meet and lawful for

you to disobey your undoubted king, being a prince most innocent, most godly, and most careful for your sorrow and wealth? If any thing can declare disobedience, what can declare it more than subjects to come with force of arms to their natural king and prince, and say, *This we will have?*

But now, leaving your rude and unhandsome manner of speech to your most sovereign lord, I will come to the point, and join with you in the effect of your first Article. You say, you will have all the holy decrees observed and kept. But do you know what they be? The holy decrees, as I told you before, be called the bishop of Rome's ordinances and laws. Which how *holy* and *godly* soever they be called, they be indeed so wicked, so ungodly, so full of tyranny and so partial, that since the beginning of the world, were never devised or invented the like. I shall rehearse certain of them, that yourselves may see how holy they be, and may say your minds, whether you would have them kept or no. And at the hearing of them, if you shall not think them meet to be kept here in this realm, then you may see how they deceived you, that moved you to ask this Article. And if you like them, and would have them kept, after you know what they be, then I say assuredly, that you be not only wicked papists, but also heretics, and most heinous traitors to the king and this his realm. And yet how

an absolute papist varieth from a heretic or traitor, I know not; but that a papist is also both a heretic and a traitor withal.

One decree saith, "That whosoever doth not acknowledge himself to be under the obedience of the bishop of Rome is a heretic." Now answer me to this question, Whether be you under the obedience of the bishop of Rome, or not? If you say that you be under his obedience, then be you traitors by the laws of this realm. And if you deny it, then be you heretics by this decree. And shift there is none to save you from treason, but to renounce this decree, that commandeth you to be under the bishop of Rome; and so to confess contrary to your own first Article, That all decrees are not to be kept.

Yet a great [1]many other decrees be as evil, and worse than this. One saith, "That all princes' laws, which be against a decree of the bishop of Rome, be void, and of no strength." Another decree saith, "That all the decrees of the bishop of Rome ought for ever to be kept of all men, as God's Word." Another decree there is, "That whosoever receiveth not the law of the bishop of Rome, neither availeth him the catholic faith, nor the four Evangelists: for his sin shall never be forgiven." Yet there is a worse and more detestable decree, "That all kings and princes, that

[1] See also vol. i. p. 358.

suffer the bishop of Rome's decrees to be broken in any point, are to be taken as infidels." Another is there also, "That the bishop of Rome is bound to no manner of decrees, but he may constrain all other persons, both spiritual and temporal, to receive all his decrees and canons." Another is yet more devilish than any before rehearsed, "That although the bishop of Rome neither regard his own salvation, nor any man's else, but put down with himself headlong innumerable people by heaps unto hell, yet may no mortal man presume to reprove him therefore." But what should I tarry, and make you weary in rehearsing a number? For a thousand other like canons and decrees there be, to the advancement of the bishop of Rome's usurped power and authority.

I cannot think of you, that you be so far from all godliness, from all wit and discretion, that you would have these decrees observed within this realm, which be so blasphemous to God, so injurious to all princes and realms, and so far from all equity and reason. But here you may easily perceive what wily foxes you met withal, which persuaded you to arm yourselves, to make sedition in your own country, to stand against your princes, and the laws of your realm, for such Articles as you understand not, and *to ask you wist not what.* For I dare say for you, that the subtil papists, when they moved you to stand in this

Article, that all the holy decrees should be observed, they shewed you nothing of these decrees, that they would have taken for *holy* decrees. For if they had, they knew right well, that you would never have consented unto this Article; but would have taken them for traitors, that first moved you thereto.

For now shall I shew you what miserable case you should bring yourselves unto, if the king's Majesty should assent unto this first Article, that all the decrees should be kept and observed. For among other partial decrees made in favour of the clergy, this is one, "That none of the clergy shall be called, or sued, before any temporal judge, for any manner of cause, either for debt, suit of lands, felony, murder, or for any other cause or crime; nor shall have any other judge, but his bishop only." Another is, "That a spiritual man may sue a temporal man before a temporal or spiritual judge at his pleasure; but a temporal man cannot sue a spiritual, but only before his ordinary." I cannot deny, but these [have] been good and beneficial laws for the liberty of the clergy! But for your own part, I suppose you do not think it any indifferent law, that a priest shall sue you where he list with the licence of his ordinary; and you shall sue him for no manner of cause, but only before his own ordinary: or if a priest had slain one of your sons or brother, that you should have no remedy

against him, but only before the bishop. What mean those papistical priests, that stirred you to ask and will such decrees and laws to be observed in this realm, but covertly and craftily to bring you under their subjection? And that you yourselves ignorantly *asking you wist not what,* should put your own heads under their girdles?

For surely if you had known these decrees, when you consented to this Article, you would have torn the Article in pieces, and they that moved you thereto also. For these decrees be not only partial, and against all equity and reason, made only for the favour of the clergy, and the suppression of the laity; but also they be, and ever have been, clearly contrary to the laws and customs of this realm. And yet by this Article you will have the old ancient laws and customs of this realm (which have ever been used in all kings' times hitherto) to be void and to cease, and these decrees to come in their place, and be observed of all men, and gainsaid of no man. For whosoever speaketh against them, you will hold them for heretics. And in so saying look what sentence you give of yourselves, although your Article say it, yet I am sure you be not so much enemies to your own realm, that you would have the old ancient laws and customs of this realm (for the defence whereof all the noble kings of this realm have so valiantly and so justly stood against the bishops of Rome) now to be taken away and give

place unto Romish decrees. And then by your own Article you hold and condemn yourselves to be heretics.

How be you bewitched by these false papists! Why do you suffer them to abuse you by their subtilty, to make you condemn yourselves of heresy? Why do you not send them unto the king's Majesty, like arrant traitors, as indeed they be, saying unto him, "Most mighty prince, and most dread sovereign lord, we present here unto you most heinous traitors against your Majesty and realm, and greatest dissemblers and falsest deceivers of us, your simple and ignorant people, and yet in our own hearts your true and faithful subjects. We have erred, we have grievously offended your Majesty: but by ignorance being so seduced, and provoked by the crafty persuasions of these most heinous traitors, *that we wist not what we did.* But pardon us, sovereign lord, have pity upon our simplicity and ignorance; and these abominable traitors punish, according to their deservings. Have mercy, most merciful prince, of us, your poor flock, which were ignorantly led out of the way, and strike with the swords those malicious guides, that purposely would have led us to our utter destruction."

If you did thus, then would you do the parts of true, faithful, and loyal subjects; and should declare to the world, that all that you have hitherto done was done by error and ignorance. And I

would nothing doubt of the king's Majesty's clemency and mercy towards you.

But yet, to the intent that you may further know how unreasonable your first Article is, I will yet rehearse another sort of the *holy* laws and decrees. One is, "That no layman may have a benefice to farm." Another is, "That none of the clergy may give any thing to the relief of the common weal and necessity of their own realm, without the consent of the bishop of Rome." Another is, "That no layman may meddle with election, or any other thing that pertaineth unto any of the clergy." Another is, "That none of the clergy ought to give any oath of fidelity to their princes, except they have temporal lands of them." Another is, "That princes ought to obey the bishops, and the decrees of the Church, and to submit their heads unto their bishops, and not to be judges over the bishops." Another is, "Whosoever offendeth the liberties of the church, or doth break any interdiction that cometh from Rome, or conspireth against the person or estate of the bishop or see of Rome, or by any manner offendeth, disobeyeth, or rebelleth against the same bishop or see, or that killeth a priest, or offendeth personally against a bishop or other prelate, or invadeth, spoileth, withholdeth, or wasteth lands belonging the church of Rome, or to any other church, immediately subject unto Rome, or whosoever invadeth any pilgrims that go

to Rome, or any suitors to the court of Rome, or that let the devolution of causes unto that court, or that put any new charges or impositions, real or personal, upon a church, or ecclesiastical person;" and generally, "all others that offend in the cases contained in the bull," which is usually published by the bishop of Rome upon Maundy Thursday; all these can be assoiled by no priest, bishop, archbishop, nor by any other, but only by the bishop of Rome, or by his express licence. These, with an infinite number of like sort, be the *godly* and *holy* decrees, which you long so sore for, and so much desire.

Now would I know, whether you think that these decrees were made for the commonwealth of all realms, or only for the private weal of the bishop of Rome, and of his bishops and clergy? And whether you like and long for these laws; or now, at the hearing of them, your longing is done? If you like them, well, for my part, I would you had them practised among you for a while, so that the rest of the realm were not troubled, neither with you, nor with your decrees, unless you repented yourselves of your foolish demands. I think within a year you would kneel on your knees to the king's Majesty, desiring him to take from your necks the yokes and halters which you had made for yourselves.

But to conclude the sum of the first Article in few words. It is nothing else but a clear subver-

sion of the whole state and laws of this realm; and to make this realm to be whole governed by Romish laws, and to crown the idol and antichrist of Rome king of this realm, and to make our most undoubted and natural king his vile subject and slave. O! what was in your minds to ask such a thing, and so presumptuously to say, that you *will* have! I trust there be not in you so much malice and devilishness, as the Article containeth; but that you were craftily suborned by subtil papists to ask and demand *you wist not what.*

If you had asked, that the Word of God might be duly observed and kept every where within this realm; and whosoever would gainsay God's Word, to be holden as a heretic: If you had declared yourselves to be godly men; all that be godly would have commended and furthered your requests. But forasmuch as you ask Romish canons and decrees to be observed and kept here in England, and whosoever shall gainsay them, to be holden as heretics, there is neither godly nor truly English man that will allow you, or consent to your Articles. But clean contrary to your Articles, a great number of godly persons within this realm, for the very love they have to God, that His Name may be glorified above all things, be daily humble suitors to the king's Majesty, that he, following the steps of his father, will study and travail to weed out of this his realm all popish decrees, laws and canons, and whatsoever else is

contrary to God's Word; and that the speakers against God's Word may be taken, as they be indeed, for heretics. And is any of you so far from reason, that bethinketh the king's Majesty ought to hearken to you, that by force and stubbornness say, you will have Romish laws and decrees kept in this realm, and to turn his ears from them that with all humility be suitors for God's Word?

But now will I come to your other Articles, wherein I will be brief, forasmuch as in the first I have been long and tedious.

II. Your SECOND ARTICLE is this. *We will have the law of our sovereign lord king Henry VIII. concerning the Six Articles, to be used again, as in his time they were.*

Letting pass your rude style, nothing becoming subjects to say, *you will have*, First, I examine you of the cause of your wilful will, wherefore you will have these Six Articles, which never were laws in any region, but this; nor in this realm also, until the 31st year of king Henry VIII.; and in some things so enforced by the evil counsel of certain papists against the truth, and common judgment, both of divines and lawyers, that if the king's Majesty himself had not come personally into the parliament house, those laws had never passed. And yet within a year, or little more, the same most noble prince was fain to temper his said laws, and moderate them in divers points. So that the statute of Six Articles continued in

force little above the space of one year. Is this then so great a matter to make these uproars, and to arise against the whole realm? Will you take away the present laws of this realm, which be and ever have been the laws of all other countries also, and set up new laws, which never were, but in this realm only, and were here in force not fully thirteen months? And how chanceth it, that you be so earnest in this Article, which is directly contrary to your first Article, but that you know not what either of the Articles meaneth; but be persuaded by papists to ask *you wot not what?* But now here is the repugnance of the two Articles: By your First you will have all general councils and decrees observed and kept; and by your Second Article you will have the Six Articles used again. Then let us compare the general councils and decrees with the Six Articles; and you shall see them agree as well together, as black and white.

First, it is contained in the canons of the Apostles that a priest under no pretence of holiness may put away his wife; and if he do, he shall be excommunicate. And the Six Articles say, that if any priest put not away his wife, he shall be taken for a felon. If he keep her not still, he must be excommunicate by the canons of the Apostles. And if he keep her still, he must suffer death by the Six Articles. You be cunning men, if you can set these together. Also the Council of Nice,

which was the chief of all the general councils, and was celebrated more than twelve hundred years past, [1] decreed clean contrary to the Six Articles. For where the Six Articles command all priests to be separate from their wives, the Nicene Council determined clean contrary, that they should not be separated, confessing such conjunction to be *holy* and *godly*. And the Council of Gangrense, which was about the same time, so much allowed the marriage of priests, that they accursed them that would abstain from the ministration of priests, because they were married. These councils vary so far from the Six Articles, that either you must put the general councils out of your book, or else the Six Articles.

Likewise, concerning private masses, the law of Six Articles far differeth from the canon of the Apostles, and from the councils, Nicene and Antioch, as shall be declared in the next Article.

Other things there be divers also in the Six Articles, which cannot stand with sundry old canons, decrees, and councils. So that if you will stand to the canons, decrees, and councils, you must of force be constrained utterly to put out of your book your second Article, which requireth the usage of the Six Articles. But now for shortness of time I will come to your third Article.

[1] See before as to the marriage of priests, vol. i. p. 267.

III. Your Third Article is this. *We will have the mass in Latin, as was before, and celebrated by the priest, without any man or woman communicating with him.*

Forasmuch as there is nothing with you but *will*, let your will be conferred with reason and God's Word; and then you shall see how far your will differeth from them both: First, as touching the Latin masses, Whatsoever the priest saith in the old masses, whether he pray and ask any thing of God, or give thanks to God, or make the true profession of the faith, or whatsoever he doth besides, all he doth in your persons and in your names; and you answer unto that, which he saith, sometimes *Amen*, sometimes, *Et cum spiritu tuo;* and sometimes other things, as the matter serveth. For all the whole that is done should be the act of the people, and pertain to the people, as well as to the priest. And standeth it with reason, that the priest should speak for you, and in your name, and you answer him again in your own persons; and yet you understand never a word, neither what he saith, nor what you say yourselves? The priest prayeth to God for you, and you answer *Amen* you wot not whereto. Is there any reason herein? Will you not understand what the priest prayeth for you? What thanks he giveth for you? What he asketh for you? Will you neither understand what he saith, nor let your hearts understand what your

own tongues answer? Then must you needs confess yourselves to be such people as Christ spake of, when he said, "These people honour me with their lips, but their hearts be far from me." Had you rather be like pies or parrots that be taught to speak, and yet understand not one word what they say, than be true Christian men that pray unto God in heart and in faith? The priest is your proctor and attorney, to plead your cause, and to speak for you all; and had you rather not know, than know, what he saith for you? I have heard suitors murmur at the bar, because their attornies have pleaded their cases in the French tongue, which they understood not. Why then be you offended, that the priests which plead your cause before God, should speak such language as you may understand? If you were before the king's Highness, and should choose one to speak for you all, I am sure you would not choose one that should speak Greek or Hebrew, French or Italian; no, nor one that should speak Latin neither. But you would be glad to provide such one, as should speak your own language, and speak so loud, that you might both hear him, and understand him; that you might allow or disallow that which he said in your names. Why do you then refuse to do the like unto God?

When the priest desireth any thing of God for you, or giveth thanks for you, how can you in

your heart confirm his sayings, when you know not one word what he saith? For the heart is not moved with words that be not understood.

But if reason will not persuade you, I will prove what God's Word will do unto you. St. Paul, in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, saith, that whosoever shall speak to the people in the church to their edification, must speak such language as the people may understand: or else he willeth him to hold his peace, and speak softly to himself and to God. For he which speaketh in a strange language, which the people understand not, doth not edify them, as St. Paul saith. And he giveth an example of the trumpet in the field, which when it giveth such a sound, that the soldier understandeth, it availeth much. For every soldier thereby knoweth what to do. But if such a blast be blown as no man understandeth, then the blast is utterly in vain. For no man knoweth thereby whether the horsemen shall make them ready, or leap upon horseback, or go to their standard; or whether the footmen shall make ready, or set themselves in array, or set upon the enemy, or retire to the standard. Even so should the priest be God's trump in his church. So that if he blow such a certain blast, that the people may understand, they be much edified thereby. But if he give such a sound, as is to the people unknown, it is clearly in vain, saith

St. Paul. For he speaks to the air, but no man is the better or edified thereby; nor knoweth what he should do by that he heareth. Furthermore in the same place St. Paul saith, that if a man giveth thanks to God in a language to the people unknown, how can they say *Amen* to that they understand not? He doth well in giving thanks to God; but that nothing availeth or edifieth the people, that know not what he saith. And St. Paul in one brief sentence concludeth his whole disputation of that matter, saying, "I had rather have five words spoken in the church to the instruction and edifying of the people, than ten thousand in a language unknown, that edifieth not." And for this purpose allegeth the prophet Esay, who saith, that "God will speak to his people in other languages." Meaning thereby that He would speak to every country in their own language. So have the Greeks the mass in the Greek tongue, the Syrians in the Syriac tongue, the Armenians in their tongue, and the Indians in their own tongue. And be you so much addicted to the Romish tongue, which is the Latin tongue, that ye will have your mass in none other language, but the Romish language? Christ himself used among the Jews the Jews' language; and willeth his Apostles to do the like in every country wheresoever they came. And be you such enemies to your own country, that you will not suffer us

to laud God, to thank him, and to use his sacraments in our own tongue; but will inforce us contrary, as well to all reason, as to the Word of God?

So many as be godly, or have reason, will be satisfied with this. But the mere papists will be satisfied with nothing. Wherefore I will no longer tarry to satisfy them that never will be satisfied, but will proceed to the second part of the Article, wherein you say, that you will have neither men nor women communicate with the priest. Alas! good simple souls, how be you blinded with the papists! How contrary be your Articles to one another! You say in your first Article, that you will have all general councils and decrees observed, and now you go from them yourselves. You say, you will have nobody to communicate with the priest. Hear then what divers canons, decrees, and general councils say clean against you. There is one decree which saith thus, "When the consecration is done, let all the people receive the communion, except they will be put out of the church." And in the canons of the Apostles, in the eighth chapter, is contained, "That whensoever there is any mass, or communion, if any bishop, priest, deacon, or any other of the clergy, being there present, do not communicate, (except he can shew some reasonable cause to the contrary,) he shall be put out of the communion, as one that giveth occasion to the people to think evil of the ministers."

And in the ninth chapter of the same canons of the Apostles, and in the general council held at Antioch, is thus written, "That all Christian people that come into the Church, and hear the Holy Scriptures read, and after will not tarry to pray, and to receive the holy communion, with the rest of the people; but for some misordering of themselves, will abstain therefrom, let them be put out of the Church, until by humble acknowledging of their fault, and by the fruits of penance and prayers they obtain pardon and forgiveness." And the council of Nicene also sheweth the order, how men should sit in receiving the communion, and who should receive first. All these decrees and general councils utterly condemn your third Article, wherein you will that the priest shall receive the communion alone, without any man or woman communicating with him. And the whole Church of Christ also, both Greeks and Latins, many hundred years after Christ, and the Apostles, do all condemn this your Article; which ever received communion in flocks and numbers together, and not the priest alone.

And besides this, the very words of the mass, as it is called, shew plainly, that it is ordained not only for the priest, but for others also to communicate with the priest. For in the very canon, which they so much extol, and which is so holy, that no man may know what it is, (and therefore is read so softly that no man can hear it,) in that

same canon, I say, is a prayer concerning this; "that not only the priest, but also as many beside as communicate with him, may be fulfilled with grace and heavenly benediction." How agreeth this prayer with your Article, wherein you say, that neither man nor woman shall communicate with the priest? In another place also of the said canon, the priest prayeth for himself, and "for all that receive the communion with him, that it may be a preparation for them unto everlasting life." Which prayer were but a very fond prayer, and a very mocking with God, if nobody should communicate with the priest. And the communion concludes with two prayers in the name of the priest, and them that communicate with him, wherein they pray thus: "O Lord, that thing which we have taken in our mouth, let us take it also with pure minds, that this communion may purge us from our sins, and make us partakers of heavenly remedy." And besides all this, there be an infinite sort of post-communions in the mass-books. Which all do evidently shew that in the masses the people did communicate with the priest.

And although I would exhort every good Christian man often to receive the holy communion; yet I do not recite all these things to the intent, that I would in this corrupt world, (when men live so ungodly as they do,) that the old canons should be restored again, which command every man

present to receive the communion with the priest. Which canons, if they were now used, I fear that many would receive it unworthily. But I speak them to condemn your Articles, which would have nobody, neither man nor woman, to be communicated with the priest. Which your Article condemneth the old decrees, canons, and general councils, condemneth all the old primitive church, all the old, ancient, holy doctors and martyrs, and all the forms and manner of masses that ever were made, both new and old. Therefore eat again this Article, if you will not be condemned of the whole world, and of yourselves also by your first Article: wherein you will all decrees and general councils to be observed. But forasmuch as I have been so tedious in this Article, I will endeavour myself to be shorter in the next.

IV. Your Fourth Article is this. *We will have the sacrament hang over the high altar, and there to be worshipped, as it was wont to be; and they which will not thereto consent, we will have them die like heretics against the holy catholic faith.*

What say you, O ignorant people, in things pertaining to God? Is this the holy catholic faith, that the sacrament should be hanged over the altar and worshipped? And be they heretics that will not consent thereto? I pray you, who made this faith? Any other but the bishops of Rome? And that after more than a thousand years after the faith of Christ was full and perfect. Innocent

III. about 1215 years after Christ did ordain, that the sacrament and chrism should be kept under lock and key. But yet no mention he made of [1] hanging the sacrament over the high altar, nor of the worshipping it. After him came Honorius III. and he added further, commanding that the sacrament should be devoutly kept in a clean place, and sealed, and that the priest should often teach the people reverently to bow down to the host when it is lifted up in the mass time, and when the priests should carry it to the sick folks. And although this Honorius added the worshipping of the sacrament, yet he made no mention of the hanging thereof over the high altar, as your Article proposeth. Nor how long after, or by what means, that came first up into this realm, I think no man can tell. And in Italy it is not yet used until this day. And in the beginning of the Church it was not only not used to be hanged up, but also it was utterly forbid to be kept.

And will you have all them that will not consent to your Article to die like heretics, that hold against the catholic faith? Were the Apostles and Evangelists heretics? Were the martyrs and confessors heretics? Were all the old doctors of the church heretics? Were all Christian people heretics, until within three or four hundred years last past, that the bishops of Rome taught them

[1] See before, in the present volume, p. 22.

what they should do and believe? All they, before rehearsed, neither hanged the sacrament over the altar, nor worshipped it; and not one of them all spake any one word either of the hanging up, or worshipping of the sacrament. Marry, they speak very much of the worshipping of Christ himself, sitting in heaven at the right hand of his Father. And no man doth duly receive the sacrament, except he so, after that manner, do worship Christ, whom he spiritually receiveth, spiritually feedeth and nourisheth upon, and by whom spiritually he liveth, and continueth that life that is towards God. And this the sacrament teacheth us.

Now to knit up this Article shortly. Here is the issue of this matter; that you must either condemn of heresy the Apostles, martyrs, confessors, doctors, and all the holy Church of Christ, until the time of Innocentius and Honorius, because they hanged not the sacrament over the altar to be worshipped; or else you must be condemned yourselves, by your own Article, to die like heretics against the holy catholic faith. Now to your fifth Article.

V. Your Fifth Article is this. *We will have the sacrament of the altar but at Easter delivered to the lay people, and then but in one kind.*

Methinks you be like a man that was brought up in a dark dungeon, that never saw light, and knew nothing that is abroad in the world; and

if a friend of his, pitying his ignorance and state, would bring him out of his dungeon, that he might see the light and come to knowledge, he, being from his youth used to darkness, could not abide the light, but would wilfully shut his eyes, and be offended both with the light, and with his friend also. A most godly prince, of famous memory, king Henry VIII. our late sovereign lord, pitying to see his subjects many years so brought up in darkness, and ignorance of God, by the erroneous doctrines and superstitions of the bishop of Rome, with the counsel of all his nobles and learned men, studied by all means, and that to his no little danger and charges, to bring you out of your said ignorance and darkness unto the true light and knowledge of God's Word. And our most dread sovereign lord that now is, succeeding his father, as well in this godly intent, as in his realms and dominions, hath, with no less care and diligence, studied to perform his father's godly intent and purpose. And you, like men that wilfully shut their own eyes, refuse to receive the light, saying you will remain in your darkness. Or rather you be like men that be so far wandered out of the right way, that they can never come to it again without good and expert guides; and yet when the guides would tell you the truth, they would not be ordered by them, but would say unto them, *We will have, and follow, our own ways.*

And that you may understand how far you be wandered from the right way in this one Article, wherein you will have the sacrament of the altar delivered to the lay people but once in the year, and then but under one kind, be you assured that there was never such a law, nor such request, made among Christian people until this day. What injury do you to many godly persons, which would devoutly receive it many times, and you command the priest to deliver it them but at Easter! All learned men and godly have exhorted Christian people, (although they have not commanded them,) often to receive the communion. And, in the Apostles' time, the people at Jerusalem received it every day, as it appears by the manifest word of the Scripture. And, after, they received it in some places every day; in some places four times in the week: in some three times; some twice; commonly every where at the least once in the week. In the beginning, when men were most godly and fervent in the Holy Spirit, then they received the communion daily. But when the Spirit of God began to be more cold in men's hearts, and they waxed more worldly than godly, then their desire was not so hot to receive the communion, as it was before. And ever from time to time, as the world waxed more wicked, the more the people withdrew themselves from the holy communion. For it was so holy a thing; and the threatenings of God be so sore against

them that come thereto unworthily, that an ungodly man abhorreth it, and not without cause dare in no wise approach thereunto. But, to them that live godly, it is the greatest comfort that in this world can be imagined. And the more godly a man, the more sweetness, and spiritual pleasure, and desire, he shall have often to receive it. And will you be so ungodly to command the priest, that he shall not deliver it to him but at Easter; and then but only in one kind; when Christ ordained both the kinds, as well for the laymen as for the priests, and that to be eaten and drunken at all times?

What enemies be you to all laymen, and to yourselves also, to refuse to drink of Christ's cup, which he commanded all men to drink, upon saying, "Take and divide this among you; and, "Drink ye all of it!"

But need any more be brought for the reproving of this Article than your own first Article, where you will have kept all decrees and councils? Now in the decrees *De Consecrat. Di.* 2. there is one decree that commandeth all men to receive the communion at the least thrice in the year, at Easter, Whitsuntide, and Christmas. Another commandeth every man to receive the same upon [1] Shere-Thursday. The council Agathense saith,

[1] The Thursday before Easter, formerly so called. See Dr. Wordsworth's Ecc. Biogr. i. 295, and Nares's Glossary under the phrase.

that all laymen which receive not the communion at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide, shall not be taken for catholics. And the decree of Gelasius, that the receiving under one kind is great sacrilege. Then by your first Article you do not only condemn your fifth Article, but also you shew yourselves not to be catholics, except you receive the communion at the least three times in the year; and that under both kinds. Which is clean repugnant to this Article. And yet I pray God, you receive it worthily once in your life; which you shall never do, except you wonderfully repent this your misbehaviour; and all your lifetime study to amend and redress that you have now offended. Now to your sixth Article.

VI. Your Sixth Article is this. *We will that our curates shall minister the sacrament of baptism at all times, as well in the week day, as on the holy day.*

Who letteth your ministers to baptize your child every day, if any case of necessity so do require? But commonly it is more convenient that Baptism should not be ministered but upon the holiday, when the most number of people be together; as well for that the whole church there present may rejoice together at the receiving of new members of Christ into the same church, as also, that all men, being present, may remember, and the better know, what they promised themselves by their godfathers and godmothers in their own baptism; and

be the more earnestly stirred in their hearts to perform the same; and also may altogether pray for them that be baptized, that they may have grace to perform their profession. St. Gregory Nazianzene, as great a clerk as ever was in Christ's Church, and master to St. Hierom, counselled that children should not be christened until they came to three years of age, or thereabouts, except they were in danger of life. And it was thought sufficient to our forefathers to be done twice in the year, at Easter and Whitsuntide, as it appeareth by divers of their councils, and decrees, which forbid baptism to be ministered at any other time than Easter and Whitsuntide, except in case of necessity. And there remained lately divers signs and tokens thereof. For every Easter and Whitsun-even, until this time, the fonts were hallowed in every church, and many collects and other prayers were read for them that were baptized. But alas! in vain, and as it were a mocking with God. For at those times, except it were by chance, none were baptized, but all were baptized before. For as vigils, otherwise called watchings, remain in the calendars upon certain saints' evens, because in old times the people watched all those nights; and Vigilantius, because he speaketh against these watchings, was condemned of heresy; but now these many years those vigils remained in vain in the books, for no man did watch:

even so, until this day, the order and form of christening was read and kept every year at Easter and Whitsuntide, but none was then christened. Wherein it appeareth how far we be swerved from our forefathers.

And, to conclude this Article shortly, if you will needs have Baptism ministered no more at one time than another, then must you needs renounce your first Article; which willeth the councils and decrees of the forefathers to be observed and kept. And this briefly sufficeth for the sixth Article.

VII. Your SEVENTH ARTICLE is this. *We will have holy bread and holy water every Sunday, palms and ashes at the time accustomed; images to be set up again in every church; and all other ancient, old ceremonies, used heretofore by our mother holy Church.*

O superstition and idolatry, how they prevail among you! The very true, heavenly bread of life, the food of everlasting life, offered unto you in the sacrament of the holy communion, you refuse to eat, but only at Easter. And the cup of the most holy blood, wherewith you were redeemed and washed from your sins, you refuse utterly to drink of at any time. And yet in the stead of these you will eat often of the unsavoury and poisoned bread of the bishop of Rome, and drink of his stinking puddles, which he nameth

holy bread and holy water. Consider, O ignorant people, the authors and intents of the makers of them both. The water of baptism, and the holy bread and wine of the holy communion, none other person did ordain but Christ himself. The other that is called [1] holy bread, holy water, holy ashes, holy palms, and all other like ceremonies, ordained the bishops of Rome, adversaries to Christ, and therefore rightly called antichrist. And Christ ordained his bread, and his wine, and his water, to our great comfort, to instruct us, and teach us what things we have only by him. But antichrist, on the other side, hath set up his superstitions, under the name of holiness, to none other intent, but as the devil seeketh all means to draw us from Christ, so doth antichrist advance his *holy* superstitions, to the intent that we should take him in the stead of Christ, and believe that we have by him such things, as we have only by Christ: that is to say, spiritual food, remission of our sins, and salvation.

First, Our Saviour Christ ordained the water of Baptism to signify unto us, that as the water washeth our bodies outwardly, so we be spiritually within washed by Christ from all our sins. And as the water is called water of regeneration, or new birth, so it declareth unto us, that through Christ we be born anew, and begin a new life

[1] See before, vol. i. p. 330, and the present vol. p. 15.

towards God; and that Christ is the beginning of this new life. And as the body that is new born, although it have life within it, yet can it not continue in the spiritual life towards God, except we be continually nourished with spiritual food; and that spiritual food is Christ also. For as he is the first beginning of our spiritual life, so is he the continuance and ending thereof. And for this cause did Christ ordain in the holy communion to be eaten bread and drunken wine, that we should surely believe, that as our bodies be fed with bread and wine in these holy mysteries, so be we out of doubt, that our souls be fed [1] spiritually with the lively food of Christ's body and blood; whereby we have remission of our sins and salvation. But the bishop of Rome invented new devices of his own making, and by them promised remission of sins and salvation, that he might be set up and honoured for a saviour equal to Christ; and so to be esteemed above creatures, and to sit in the temple of God, that is in the Church of Christ, as he were God.

And to bring this to pass he hath horribly abused holy Scriptures, altering them to his purpose, in the stead of Christ's most holy blood, putting in his holy water. As it appeareth evidently in this sentence of St. Paul, written in the ninth chapter of the Hebrews: "If the blood of

[1] See before, in the present vol. p. 55.

oxen and goats," saith St. Paul, " and the ashes of a young cow purified the unclean, as touching the purifying of the flesh, how much more the blood of Christ (which through the Eternal Spirit offered himself without spot unto God) shall purge your consciences from dead works, to serve the Living God: and for this cause he is the Mediator of the new covenant." Consider well this sentence of Paul, and you shall find two purifyings, one of the body, and another of the soul, or conscience. You shall find also two Mediators; one was the priest of Moses' law, and the other is Christ. The priests of the old law, with the blood of oxen and goats, and other their sacrifices, purged only the bodies of them that were defiled; but the soul, or conscience, they could not help. But our Saviour Christ by his own blood purged both body and soul. And for that cause he, and none other, is the Mediator of the new covenant. But the bishop of Rome, to make himself also a mediator with Christ, hath taken upon him to purify the soul and conscience with holy water, holy salt, and other his holy creatures of his own devising, to the intolerable injury of Christ's blood, which only hath the effect. And to bring this to pass, he hath most shamefully changed the words of the Scripture, and wrested them to his purpose; some words putting out, and, only in the stead of Christ's blood, putting in his own holy water and salt. For

whereas St. Paul, "if the blood of oxen and goats, and the ashes of a cow purified the unclean, as touching the purifying of the flesh;" here the bishop of Rome leaveth out these words, "as touching the purifying of the flesh." And where St. Paul, extolling the effect of Christ's blood in comparison of the blood of oxen and goats, saith, "How much more the blood of Christ, which through the Eternal Spirit offered himself, being without spot, unto God, shall purge your consciences;" here the bishop of Rome, extolling his water and salt, puts out Christ's blood, and in the place thereof puts his holy water and salt; saying, "How much more water, which is sprinkled with salt, and hallowed with godly prayers, shall sanctify and purify the people!" O intolerable blasphemy against the most precious blood of Christ! O shameless audacity and boldness, so to corrupt and pervert God's holy Word! If he by his holy water presume to purify our souls, as Christ did by his blood, what is that else, but to make himself equal, and another mediator, with Christ? And what is it, to tread under foot the Son of God, and to make the blood of the New Testament (whereby he was sanctified) like other common things, and to dishonour the Spirit of grace, if this be not? And yet, not contented with this blaspheming the blood of Christ, he preferreth his holy creatures far above the blood of Christ, promising by them many benefits, which

by the blood of Christ be not promised. For in the same place he promiseth by his holy ceremonies to take away from us dearth and scarcity of all worldly things, and to multiply and increase us with the same; also to defend us from the assaults of the devil, and all his deceits, and to give us health both of body and soul. But all men see him so shamefully to lie in these worldly things, that no man, that wise is, will trust him in the rest. And no man, that is godly, will desire such things to remain still, which so much have deceived simple people, and dishonoured God, and been contumelious to the blood of Christ.

But now to your images, which, you say, you will have set up again in every church. What moved you to require this Article, but only ignorance? For if you had known the Laws of God, and the use of godly religion, as well before the Incarnation of Christ, as four or five hundred years next after, and by whom images were at first brought into Christ's Church, and how much idolatry was every where committed by the means of the same, it could not have been that ever you would have desired this Article, except you had more affection to idolatry than to true religion. For Almighty God among the ten commandments rehearsed [1] this for the second, as one of

[1] See the archbishop's addition to the German Catechism, in this volume, p. 49.

the chief, "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, nor the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, nor in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them." This commandment was diligently kept in the Old Testament, so long as the people pleased God. For in their tabernacle was not one image, less nor more, that the people might see. Although upon the propitiatory were two cherubim of gold, by the commandment of God. And that was in such a place as the people never came near, nor saw. But when the people, forgetting this commandment, began to make images, and to set them up in the place of adoration, by and by they provoked God's indignation against them, and were grievously punished therefore.

The Church of Christ likewise in the New Testament, for the space of four or five hundred years after Christ's Ascension, utterly refused to have images in the church, a place of adoration, as it may plainly appear by all the old, ancient authors that lived and wrote in that time: insomuch, that about four hundred years after Christ, when some superstitious and ignorant people, in some places, began to bring painted images, not into the church, but to the church-doors, the great clerk Epiphanius, bishop of Cyprus, finding such a painted image of Christ, or some other saint, hanging at the church-door, in a town called

Anablatha, he cut it in pieces, saying, "that it was against the authority of Scripture, that in the Church of Christ should hang the image of a man." And the same Epiphanius wrote unto the bishop of Jerusalem, that he should command the priests that in no wise they should suffer such images to be hanged in the Church of Christ, which were contrary to our religion.

But peradventure you will marvel, and ask me the question, how it was brought to pass, that of late years all churches were so full of images, and so much offering and pilgrimages done unto them, if it were against the commandment of God, against the usage of all godly people in the Old Testament, and also against the custom of Christ's Church in the New Testament, so long as it was pure and holy, and kept from idolatry? Who was able to bring this to effect, contrary both to God's express commandment, and the custom of all godly people from the beginning of the world, until four or five hundred years after Christ? No man surely could have wrought this thing, so much contrary to God, but antichrist himself, that is to say, the bishop of Rome; to whom God hath given great power to work wonders, to bring into error those that will not believe the truth. But by what means did he compass this matter? By such means as were most meet for himself, and as he hath commonly practised in all other matters; that is to say, by sedition and murder,

by confederacies and persecutions, by raising the sons against their fathers, the children against their mothers, and the subjects against their rulers; by deposing of emperors and princes, and murdering of learned men, saints, and martyrs. For thus he wrought against the emperor of the east parts from Gregory the second's time, until Gregory III. who at length, after this condition had endured above five hundred years, in a council held at Lyons, by feigned promises, persuaded the emperor of the east to condescend to his purpose, as well to receive images into the churches, as to other his requests. But nevertheless the bishop of Rome failed of his purpose. For yet to this day the Christian men in the east do not allow images to stand in their churches; neither the Greeks, nor the Armenians, nor the Indians, nor any other Christian men. And that more is, search all the world throughout, of what religion soever they be, whether they be Jews, Turks, Saracens, Tartars, or Christian people; and you shall not find an image in any of their churches, but that was brought in by the bishop of Rome, and where the bishop of Rome is, or within these forty years was, taken for the head of the church, and Christ's vicar on earth.

And at the beginning the bishops of Rome, to cloak their idolatry, pretended to have images set up only for a remembrance to laymen, and to be, as it were, laymen's books. But after they

defined plainly that these should be worshipped; and so it increased at length that images were kneeled unto, offered unto, prayed unto, sought unto, incensed, and pilgrimages done unto them, and all manner of superstition and idolatry that could be devised. Almighty God knoweth our corrupt nature better than we do ourselves. He knoweth well the inclinations of man, how much he is given to worship creatures, and the work of his own hands: and especially fond women, which commonly follow superstition rather than true religion. And therefore He utterly forbade the people the use of graven images; especially in places dedicated to the honour of God, knowing assuredly, that of the having would follow the worshipping them.

Now, thanks be to God, in this realm we be clearly delivered from that kind of idolatry, (which most highly offended God;) and we do according to the council Elibertine, which ordained that no images should be in churches. And this is so ancient, that it was about the same year that the Nicene council was. What should then move you to ask again your images in the church, being not only against God's commandments, and the use of God's Church evermore, since the beginning of the world, when it was pure from idolatry; but also being chargeable to the realm, and great occasion of heinous idolatry; but that some papistical and covetous priests have persuaded

you hereto, which care neither for God's honour, nor your damnation, so that they may have any commodity or profit thereby?

I have been very long in this Article, and yet the matter is so large, that it requireth much more to be spoken therein, which, for shortness of time, I am constrained to leave until a [1] more occasion, and so come to your eighth Article.

VIII. Your EIGHTH ARTICLE is this. *We will not receive the new service, because it is but like a Christmas game: but we will have our old service of matins, mass, even-song, and procession, in Latin, as it was before. And so we, the Cornish men, whereof certain of us understand no English, utterly refuse this new English.*

As concerning the having of the service in the Latin tongue, it is sufficiently spoken of in the answer to the third Article. But I would gladly know the reason, why the *Cornish* men refuse utterly the *new English*, as you call it, because certain of you [2] understand it not: and yet you will have the service in Latin, which almost none of you understand. If this be a sufficient cause for *Cornwall* to refuse the English service, because some of you understand no English, a much greater cause have they, both of *Cornwall* and

[1] Greater. So *more* was formerly used. See Acts xix. 32. "The *more* part knew not why," &c.

[2] See what has been observed upon this pretence in the present volume, pp. 73, 74. See also pp. 128, 129.

Devonshire, to refuse utterly the late service; forasmuch as fewer of them know the Latin tongue, than they of *Cornwall* the English tongue. But where you say, that you will have the old service, because the new is *like a Christmas game*, you declare yourselves what spirit you be led withal, or rather what spirit leadeth them, that persuaded you, that the Word of God is but like a Christmas game. It is more like a game and a fond play to be laughed at of all men, to hear the priest speak aloud to the people in Latin, and the people listen with their ears to hear; and some walking up and down in the church, some saying other prayers in Latin, and none understandeth other. Neither the priest nor his parish wot what they say. And many times the thing that the priest saith in Latin is so fond of itself, that it is more like a play than a godly prayer.

But, in the English service appointed to be read, there is nothing else but the Eternal Word of God. The New and the Old Testament is read, that hath power to save your souls: which, as St. Paul saith, "is the power of God to the salvation of all that believe;" the clear light to our eyes, without the which we cannot see; and a lantern unto our feet, without which we should stumble in darkness. It is in itself the Wisdom of God, and yet to the Jews it is a stumbling block, and to the Gentiles it is but foolishness. "But to such as be called of God, whether they be Jews or Gentiles,

it is the power of God and the wisdom of God." Then unto you if it be but foolishness and a *Christmas game*, you may discern yourselves what miserable state you be in, and how far you be from God. For St. Paul saith plainly, that the Word of God is foolishness only to them that perish; but to them that shall be saved it is God's might and power. To some it is a lively savour unto life; and to some it is a deadly savour unto death. If it be to you but a *Christmas game*, it is then a savour of death unto death. And surely persuade yourselves, that you be not led by the Spirit of God, so long as the Word of God savoureth no better unto you, but seemeth unto you a Christmas pastime and foolishness; and therefore the old service pleaseth you better, which in many things is so foolish and so ungodly, that it seems rather to be old wives' tales and lies, than to sound to any godliness. The devil is a liar, and the author of lies: and they may think themselves governed rather of his spirit, than of God, when lies delight more than God's most true Word.

But this I judge rather of your leaders than of yourselves, who by ignorance be carried away by others, you wot not whither. For when the service was in the Latin tongue, which you understood not, they might read to you truth or fables, godly or ungodly things, as they pleased: but you could not judge that which you understood

not. And what was the cause why St. Paul would have such languages spoken in the church as that people might understand? That they might learn and be edified thereby, and judge of that which should be spoken, whether it were according to God's Word, or not.

But forasmuch as you understand not the old Latin service, I shall rehearse some things in English, that were wont to be read in Latin, that when you understand them you may judge them, whether they seem to be true tales or fables: and whether they, or God's Word, seem to be more like plays and Christmas games. "The devil entered into a certain person, in whose mouth St. Martin put his finger; and because the devil could not get out at his mouth, the man blew him, or cacked him out behind!"—This was one of the tales that was wont to be read in the Latin service that you will needs have again. Is this a grave and godly matter to be read in the church, or rather a foolish Christmas tale, or an old wife's fable, worthy to be laughed at, and scorned of every man that hath either wit or godly judgment? Yet more foolish, erroneous, and superstitious things be read in the feasts of St. Blase, St. Valentine, St. Margaret, St. Peter, of the Visitation of our Lady, and the Conception, of the Transfiguration of Christ, and in the feast of Corpus Christi, and a great number more; whereof some be most vain fables, some very superstitious, some

directly against God's Word, and the laws of this realm; and altogether be full of error and superstition. But as Christ commonly excused the simple people, because of their ignorance, and justly condemned the scribes and pharisees, which, by their crafty persuasions led the people out of the right way: so I think you not so much to be blamed, as those pharisees and papistical priests, which, abusing your simplicity, caused you *to ask you wist not what,* desiring rather to drink of the dregs of corrupt error, which you know not, than of the pure and sweet wine of God's Word, which you may and ought to understand. But now have I sufficiently spoke of your eighth Article: I will go forward unto the ninth.

IX. Your NINTH ARTICLE is this. *We will have every preacher in his sermon, and every priest at the mass, pray especially by name for the souls in purgatory, as our forefathers did.*

To reason with you by learning, which be unlearned, it were but folly; therefore I will convince your Article with very reason. First, Tell me I pray, if you can, whether there be a purgatory, or no: and where or what it is. And if you cannot tell, then I may tell you, that *you ask you wot not what.* The Scripture maketh mention of two places, where the dead be received after this life, viz. of heaven, and of hell; but of purgatory is not one word spoken. Purgatory was wont to be called a fire, as hot as hell, but not so

long during. But now the defenders of purgatory within this realm be ashamed so to say: nevertheless they say, it is a third place. Where or what it is, they confess they cannot tell. And of God's Word they have nothing to shew neither where it is, nor what it is, nor that it is. But all is feigned of their own brains, without authority of Scripture.

I would ask of them then, Wherefore it is, and to what use it serveth? For if it be to no use, then it is a thing frustrate and in vain. Marry, say they, it is a place of punishment, whereby they be purged from their sins, that depart out of this life, not fully purged before. I cannot tell, whether this saying be more foolish, or more contumelious to Christ. For what can be more foolish than to say, that pains can wash sins out of the soul. I do not deny but that corrections and punishments in this life, is a calling of men to repentance and amendment; and so to be purged by the blood of Christ. But correction without repentance can nothing avail: and they that be dead be past the time of repentance; and so no correction or torments in purgatory can avail them. And what a contumely and injury is this to Christ, to affirm that all have not full and perfect purgation by his blood, that die in his faith! Is not all our trust in the blood of Christ, that we be cleansed, purged and washed thereby? And will you have us now to forsake our faith in

Christ, and bring us to the pope's purgatory, to be washed therein; thinking that Christ's blood is an imperfect lee or soap, that washeth not clean? If he shall die without mercy that treads Christ's blood under his feet, what is treading of his blood under our feet, if this be not? But if according to the catholic faith, which the Holy Scripture teacheth, and the Prophets, Apostles, and Martyrs confirmed with their blood, all the faithful that die in the Lord be pardoned of all their offences by Christ, and their sins be clearly spunged and washed away by his blood, shall they, after, be cast into another strong and grievous prison of purgatory, there to be punished again for that which was pardoned before? God hath promised by his Word, that the souls of the Jews be in God's hand, and no pain shall touch them: and again he saith, "Blessed be they that die in the Lord. For the Spirit of God saith, that from henceforth they shall rest from their pains." And Christ himself saith, "He that believeth in Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come to judgment, but shall pass from death unto life." And is God no truer of His promises, but to punish that which He promiseth to pardon? Consider the matter by your own cases. If the king's Majesty should pardon your offences, and, after, would cast you into prison, would you think that he had well observed his promise? For what is to pardon your offences, but to pardon the pu-

nishment for the same? If the king would punish you, would you take that for a pardon? Would you not allege your pardon, and say, that you ought not to be punished? Who can then, that hath but a crumb of reason in his head, imagine of God, that He will after our death punish those things that He pardoned in our life-time?

Truth it is, that Scripture maketh mention of paradise and Abraham's bosom after this life; but those be places of joy and consolation, not of pain and torments. But yet I know what subtil sophisters use to mutter in men's ears to deceive them withal. David, say they, with many other, were pardoned of their offences, and yet were they sore punished after, for the same, of God. And some of them, so long as they lived. Well, be it were so. Yet, after their lives, they were not punished in purgatory therefore. But the end of their lives was the end of their punishment. And likewise it is of original sin after Baptism, which although it be pardoned, yet after pains thereof continue so long as we live. But this punishment in this life time is not to revenge our original sin, which is pardoned in Baptism; but to make us humble, penitent, obedient to God, fearful to offend, to know ourselves, and ever to stand in fear and awe; as if a father, that hath beaten a wilful child for his faults, should hang the rod continually at the child's girdle, it should be no small pain and grief to the child,

ever hanging by his side; and yet the father doth it not to beat the child for that which is past and forgiven; but to make him beware hereafter, that he offend not again, and to be gentle, tractable, obedient, and loth to do any thing amiss. But after this life there is no such cause of punishment; where no rod nor whip can force any man to go any faster or further, being already at the end of his journey. Likewise a master, that hath an unthrifty servant, which out of his master's sight doth nothing but riot and disorder himself, if he forgive his servant, and for the love he beareth to him, and the desire he hath to see him corrected and reformed, he will command him never to be out of his sight: this command, although indeed it be a great pain to the servant, yet the master doth it not to punish those faults which before he had pardoned and forgiven, but to keep him in stay, that he fall no more to like disorder. But these examples and cases of punishment here in this life, can in no wise be wrested and drawn to the life to come; and so in no wise can serve for purgatory.

And furthermore, seeing that the Scriptures so often and so diligently teach us, almost in every place, to relieve all them that be in necessity, to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to visit the sick and the prisoner, to comfort the sorrowful; and so to all others that have need of our help: and the same in no place make mention either of

such pains in purgatory, or what comfort we may do them; it is certain that the same is feigned for lucre, and not grounded upon God's Word. For else the Scripture in some place would have told us plainly what case they stood in that be in purgatory, and what relief and help we might do unto them. But as for such as God's Word speaketh not one word of neither of them both, my counsel shall be, that you keep not the bishop of Rome's decrees, that you may come to purgatory, but keep God's Laws, that you may come to heaven. Or else I promise you assuredly, that you shall never escape hell. Now to your next Article.

X. Your Tenth Article is this. *We will have the Bible, and all books of Scripture in English, to be called in again. For we be informed, that otherwise the clergy shall not of long time confound the heretics.*

Alas! it grieveth me to hear your Articles: and much I rue and lament your ignorance: praying God most earnestly once to lighten your eyes, that you may see the truth. What Christian heart would not be grieved to see you so ignorant, (for willingly and wilfully, I trust, you do it not,) that you refuse Christ, and join yourselves with antichrist! You refuse the Holy Bible, and all Holy Scriptures so much, that you will have them called in again; and the bishop of Rome's decrees you will have advanced and observed. I may well say to you, as Christ said to Peter,

"Turn back again, for you savour not godly things." As many of you as understand no Latin cannot know God's Word but in English, except it be the Cornish men, which can understand likewise none but their own speech. Then you must be content to have it in English, which you know, or else you must confess, that you utterly refuse the knowledge thereof. And wherefore did the Holy Ghost come down in fiery tongues, and give them knowledge of all languages, but that all nations might hear, speak, and learn, God's Word in their mother tongue? And can you name me any Christians in all the world, but they have, and ever had, God's Word in their own tongue? And the Jews, to whom God gave his Scriptures in the Hebrew tongue, after their long captivity among the Chaldees, so that more of them knew the Chaldee rather than the Hebrew tongue, they caused the Scripture to be turned into the Chaldee tongue, that they might understand it; which until this day is called Targum. And Ptolomy, king of Egypt, caused sixty [seventy] of the greatest clerks, that might be gotten, to translate the Scriptures out of Hebrew into Greek. And until this day the Greeks have it in the Greek tongue; the Latins in the Latin tongue, and all other nations in their own tongue. And will you have God further from us, than from all other countries; that He shall speak to every man in his own language that he understandeth, and was

born in, and to us shall speak a strange language that we understand not? And will you, that all other realms shall laud God in their own speech, and we shall say to Him *we know not what?*

Although you savour so little of godliness, that you wist not to read His Word yourselves, you ought not to be so malicious and envious to [1] let them that be more godly, and would gladly read it to their comfort and edification. And if there be an English heretic, how will you have him confuted, but in English? And whereby else, but by God's Word? Then it followeth, that to confute English heretics, we must have God's Word in English, as all other nations have it in their own native language. St. Paul to the Ephesians teacheth all men, as well laymen as priests, to arm themselves, and to fight against all adversaries with God's Word; without the which we cannot be able to prevail, neither against subtil heretics, puissant devils, this deceitful world, nor our own sinful flesh. And therefore, until God's Word came to light, the bishop of Rome, under the prince of darkness, reigned quietly in the world: and his heresies were received and allowed for the true catholic faith. And it can none otherwise be, but that heresies must reign, where the light of God's Word driveth not away our darkness.

[1] Hinder.

XI. Your ELEVENTH ARTICLE is this. *We will have Dr. Moreman and Dr. Crispin, which hold our opinions, to be safely sent unto us; and to them we require the king's Majesty to give some certain livings, to preach among us our catholic faith.*

If you be of [1] Moreman's and Crispin's faith, I like you much the worse. For *like lettice, like lips.* And to declare you plainly the qualities of Crispin and Moreman, and how unmeet men they be to be your teachers, they be persons very ignorant of God's Word; and yet thereto very wilful, crafty, and full of dissimulation. For, if they were profoundly learned, and of sincere judgments, as they be not, they might be godly teachers of you. Or if they were not *toto* wilful, and standing wholly in their own conceits, they might learn, and be

[1] Of Crispin, Strype says, he could find only that he was once proctor of the university of Oxford, of Oriel College, and doctor of physic. He appears to have read the Medicine Lecture there in 1545. Wood, Ann. Univ. Ox. He died in March 1549-50. Wood, Fasti. Oxon. The archbishop appears to allude to his earlier profession in this answer. Strype pronounces him a divine, but not beneficed. Moreman was an ecclesiastic, who had obtained preferment in Cornwall, in the reign of Henry, and at that time seemed zealous in the cause of the Reformation, teaching his parishioners the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Commandments, in English. In the present reign he had returned to the old superstitions; and hence, as Strype observes, the archbishop's accusation speaks of him as "full of craft and *hypocrisy*." He now escaped punishment, and in the reign of Mary was made dean of Exeter. He died in 1553.

taught of others. But they be so wilful that they will not learn, and so ignorant that they cannot teach, and so full of craft and hypocrisy that they be able to deceive you all, and to lead you into error after themselves. So that if you ask them, you ask your own poison. Now if a man were in such a sickness that he longed for poison, (as many diseases desire things most noyful unto them,) yet it were not the part of a good physician to give it unto them. No more is it the office of a most godly prince to give you such teachers, although you long never so sore for them, as he knoweth would corrupt you; feeding you rather with sour and unwholesome leaven of Romish pharisaical doctrine, than with the sweet, pure, and wholesome bread of God's heavenly Word. Where you would have God's Word in English destroyed, and Crispin and Moreman delivered unto you, you do even as the people of the Jews did; who cried out that Christ might be crucified, and that Barabbas, the strong thief, might be delivered unto them.

XII. Your TWELFTH ARTICLE is this. *We think it very meet, because the lord Cardinal Pole is of the king's blood, that he should not only have his pardon, but also be sent for to Rome, and promoted to be of the king's Council.*

In this Article I will answer no more but this, if ever cardinal or legate were beneficial unto this realm, we may have some hope of some other to

follow his steps. But if all that ever were in this realm were pernicious and hurtful unto the same, I know not why we should be with child to long for any more. For by the experience of them that have been heretofore, we may conjecture of them that be to come. And I fear me, that cardinal Pole would follow rather the old race of the rest, than to begin a better of himself. Surely I have read a book of his making, which whosoever shall read, if he have a true heart to our late sovereign lord king Henry VIII. or to this realm, he will judge cardinal Pole neither worthy to dwell in this realm, nor yet to live. For he doth extend all his wits and [1] eloquence in that book to persuade the bishop of Rome, the emperor, the French king, and all other princes, to invade this realm by force. And sure I am, that if you have him, you must have the bishop of Rome also. For the cardinal cannot be a subject, but where

[1] Cranmer fairly admits the *eloquence* of Pole's most traitorous exhortation, which to the emperor Charles in particular is very observable. The book is entitled *Pro Ecclesiasticæ Unitatis Defensione.* It was sent to Henry by the cardinal in 1536. But as yet this was the alarm of words only. It was not till 1539 that the king was forced to preparations against the dangers which the traitor and the pontiff threatened. Stow, 974. See also Norton's Warning against the dangerous practices of the Papists, sign. D. iiij. 8. And Sampson's (bishop of Chichester, an opponent much abused by Pole) Preface to his Explanation of the first fifty Psalms, in Latin: fol. 1539, sign. A. 3. a.

the other is his head. This sufficeth briefly to this Article.

XIII. Your THIRTEENTH ARTICLE is this. *We will that no gentleman shall have any more servants than one to wait upon him, except he may dispend one hundred mark land. And for every hundred mark we think it reasonable he should have a man.*

Yet have you not foreseen one thing, you wise disposers of the commonwealth. For if a gentleman of an hundred mark land, (who by your order must have but one servant, except he might spend two hundred marks,) should send that one servant to London, you have not provided who shall wait upon him until his servant come home again. Nor have you provided where every gentleman may have one servant, that can do all things necessary for him. I fear me the most part of you, that devised this Article, (whom I take to be loiterers and idle unthrifts,) if they should serve a gentleman, he should be fain to do all things himself, for any thing that you could, or would do for him. For one thing methinks is very strange; for where much complaint is made of divers gentlemen, because they keep not houses, you provide by your order, that no gentleman shall keep house; but all shall sojourn with other men. For who can keep a household with one servant, or with two servants, after the rate of two hundred marks, or with three after the rate of three hundred, and so upward? For here it seems you be very desirous to make gentlemen rich.

For after this proportion every gentleman may lay up clearly in his coffers at the least one half of his yearly revenues, and much more.

But it was not for good mind that you bare to the gentlemen, that you devised this Article; but it appeareth plainly that you devised it to diminish their strength, and to take away their friends, that you might command gentlemen at your pleasure. But you be much deceived in your account. For although by your appointment they lacked household servants, yet shall they not lack tenants and farmers; which, if they do their duties, will be as assured to their lords as their own household servants. For of these lands, which they have or hold of their lords, they have their whole livings for themselves, their wives, children, and servants. And for all these they attend their own business, and wait not upon their lords but when they be called thereto. But the household servant, leaving all his own business, waiteth daily and continually upon his master's service; and for the same hath no more but meat, and drink, and apparel, for himself only. So that all tenants and farmers, which know their duties, and be kind to their lords, will die and live with them, no less than their own household servants. Therefore I would wish you to put this fantasy out of your heads, and this Article out of your book, as well for the unreasonableness, as for the ungodliness thereof.

For was it ever seen in any country since the

world began, that commons did appoint the nobles, and gentlemen, the number of their servants? Standeth it with any reason to turn upside down the good order of the whole world that is every where, and ever hath been? That is to say, the commoners to be governed by the nobles, and the servants by their masters. Will you now have the subjects to govern their king, the villains to rule the gentlemen, and the servants their masters? If men would suffer this, God will not; but will take vengeance on all them that will break his order, as he did of Dathan and Abiram: although for a time He be a God of much sufferance, and hideth His indignation under His mercy, that the evil of themselves may repent, and see their own folly.

XIV. Your FOURTEENTH ARTICLE is this. *We will that the half part of the abbey lands, and chantry lands, in every man's possession, howsoever he came by them, be given again to two places, where two of the chief abbies were within every county, where such half part shall be taken out; and there to be established a place for devout persons, which shall pray for the king and the commonwealth. And to the same we will have all the alms of the church-box given for these seven years.*

At the beginning you pretended, that you meant nothing against the king's Majesty, but now you open yourselves plainly to the world, that you go about to pluck the crown from his head;

and against all justice and equity, not only to take from him such lands as be annexed unto his crown, and be parcel of the same; but also, against all right and reason, to take from all other men such lands as they came to by most just title, by gift, by sale, by exchange, or otherwise. There is no respect, nor difference had among you, whether they came to them by right or by wrong. Be you so blind, that you cannot see how unjustly you proceed, to take the sword in your hand against your prince, and to dispossess just inheritors without any cause? Christ would not take upon him to judge the right and title of lands betwixt two brethren; and you arrogantly presume, not only to judge, but unjustly to take away, all men's right titles; yea, even from the king himself. And do you not tremble for fear, that the vengeance of God shall fall upon you, before you have grace to repent? And yet you, not contented with this your rebellion, would have your shameful act celebrated with a perpetual memory; as it were to boast and glory of your iniquity. For, in memory of your fact, you would have established in every county two places to pray for the king and the commonwealth: whereby your abominable behaviour at this present may never be forgotten, but be remembered unto the world's end; that when the king's Majesty was in wars with Scotland and France, you, under pretence of the commonwealth, rebelled,

and made so great sedition against him within his own realm, as never before was heard of; and therefore must be prayed for, for ever, in every county of this realm!

It were more fit for you to make humble supplication upon your knees to the king's Majesty, desiring him not only to forgive you this fault, but also that the same may never be put in chronicle nor writing; and that neither shew nor mention may remain to your posterity, that ever subjects were so unkind to their prince, and so ungracious toward God, that contrary to God's Word they should so use themselves against their sovereign lord and king. And this I assure you of, that if all the whole world should pray for you until doomsday, their prayers should no more avail you, than they should avail the devils in hell, if they prayed for them; unless you be so penitent and sorry for your disobedience, that you will ever hereafter, so long as you live, study to [1] redubbe and recompense the same with all true and faithful obedience; and not only yourselves, but also procuring all other, so much as lieth in you; and so much detesting such uproars and seditions, that if you see any man towards any such things, you will to your power resist him, and open him unto such governors and rulers as may straightway repress the same. As for your last Article,

[1] To make amends for. Low Lat. *redebere*. Vid. Du Cange in voce.

thanks to be God, it needs not to be answered, which is this.

XV. *For the particular griefs of our country, we will have them so ordered, as Humfrey Arundel, and Henry Bray, the king's mayor of Bodmin, shall inform the king's Majesty, if they may have safe conduct in the king's great seal to pass and repass with a herald of arms.*

Who ever heard such arrogancy in subjects, to require and will of their princes that their own particular causes may be ordered, neither according to reason, nor the laws of the realm, but according to the information of two most heinous traitors? Was it ever heard before this time, that information should be a judgment, although the informers were of never so great credit? And will you have suffice the information of two villainous papistical traitors? You will deprive the king of his lands pertaining to his crown, and other men of their just possessions and inheritances, and judge your own causes as you list yourselves. And what can you be called then, but most wicked judges and most arrant traitors; except only ignorance or force may excuse you; that either you were constrained by your captains against your wills, or deceived by blind priests, and other crafty persuaders, *to ask you wist not what?* How much then ought you to detest and abhor such men hereafter, and to beware of all such like, as

long as you live: and to give most humble and hearty thanks unto God, who hath made an end of this Article, and brought [1]Arundel and Bray to that they have deserved; that is, perpetual shame, confusion, and death? Yet I beseech God so to extend his grace unto them, that they may die well which have lived ill. *Amen.*

[1] Humphry Arundel, Esq. the leader of the ten thousand Devonshire rebels, was commander of St. Michael's Mount: Bray, the mayor of Bodmin in Cornwall. Both of them were executed in London. The vicar of St. Thomas, another of the principal incendiaries, was hanged on the top of his own tower, "apparelled in his popish weeds, with his beads at his girdle." Heylin. Strype.

CHAPTER VI.

1549.

Deprivation of Bonner—Fall of lord Seymour—Latimer's reflections on that nobleman—Proceedings against Anabaptists and other sectaries—The case of Joan Bocher, commonly called Joan of Kent—The case of Van Paris, a Dutchman—Cranmer's conduct in regard to both—The fall of the Protector—Cranmer's attachment to him.

THE commotions, which Cranmer thus endeavoured to appease, Bonner had artfully fomented. Released from his [1] short confinement, after his concurring with Gardiner in opposition to the Homilies, he forbore not to impede the subsequent measures of the Reformers, and executed the orders of the Council only in a manner which evinced his contempt of them. His [2] aversion to circulate through his diocese the new Liturgy, and his neglect to enjoin the use of it, were well known. The resort to places, where mass might still be heard, he countenanced. To the rebels

[1] See before, p. 18. [2] Heylin.

this episcopal disloyalty had been no small encouragement. Before the Council he was accordingly summoned, and was [1] enjoined to denounce, in a public discourse at St. Paul's Cross, the unlawfulness of taking arms on pretence of religion, and to assert the power of the sovereign during his minority. Instead of adhering to the subjects thus prescribed, he chose to defend the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and to censure those who opposed it. Among his auditors were Hooper, afterwards Bishop of Gloucester, and William Latimer, a London divine. By them, with the concurrence of many others, informations were laid against him; and in consequence, a commission was issued under the great seal to Cranmer, Ridley, the two secretaries of state, and the dean of St. Paul's, to hear the accusations, and, if they could not be refuted, to suspend, imprison, or deprive him. Before the commissioners he appeared on seven separate days of examination; in each of which he conducted himself with insolence and levity, very unsuitable to the occasion, but in unison with the rude and brutal manners by which he was generally known. To the archbishop, who had been his patron, deceived, indeed, as Cromwell had also been, by his [2] professions of regard for the circulation of the Scriptures, he thus addressed himself at his first examination, [3] "What,

[1] Foxe, Heylin, Strype. [2] Foxe, [3] Ibid.

are you here, my lord? By my troth, I saw you not."—"You would not see," the archbishop answered.—"Well," replied Bonner, "you have now sent for me hither, what have you to say to me?"—The commissioners then told him, We call you to account for not preaching upon the subjects prescribed to you. This charge he affected not to notice; but, turning to the archbishop, observed, "[1] I would one thing were had in more reverence than it is."—"What is that?" said Cranmer.—"The blessed mass," Bonner answered; "and as you have written well upon the sacrament, I marvel that you honour it not more." —Cranmer replied, "If you think well of what [2] I have written, it is because you understood it not."—"I understood it, I think, better than you who wrote it," rejoined the contemptuous prelate. This interruption was closed, by the archbishop observing, "I could easily make a child of ten years old understand therein as much as you; *but what is this to the matter before us?*" The process no longer halted. Upon the witnesses who testified against him, and upon the bystanders who seemed to approve their evidence, Bonner

[1] Foxe, Strype.

[2] Cranmer's translation of Justus Jonas's Catechism. The mistakes of others, as well as of Bonner, in regard to the corporal presence as maintained by the archbishop, in consequence of the translations, are noticed, in the present volume, by Cranmer himself. See before, pp. 53, 54.

now repeatedly bestowed the [1] proverbial appellation of woodcocks, or the coarser term of fools. Against the authority of his judges he disputed, not without acuteness indeed, but also not without disgusting acrimony; and he appealed from it to that of the king. By them, however, he was deprived; and by the sovereign his repeal was rejected. After his deprivation, he was still considered too dangerous to be exempted from imprisonment during the pleasure of the king.

Previously to this proceeding against a distinguished ecclesiastic, Cranmer had assisted in confirming the judicial sentence passed upon a high political personage. In the early part of this year fell the brother of the Protector, the lord admiral Seymour, whose well-known ambition had led him to proceedings dangerous to the state; the warrant for whose execution was unfeelingly signed by the Protector, and uncanonically by Cranmer, the interference of bishops in a cause of blood being [2] contrary to the ancient canon laws. The conduct of the former exposed him to much blame; that of the latter could not escape animadversion. Burnet says, that Cranmer thought his conscience was under no tie to the canons, and therefore judged it not contrary to his function to sign the

[1] "Among us in England, this bird is infamous for its simplicity or folly; so that a *woodcock* is proverbially used for a foolish simple person." Willoughby's Ornithology.

[2] Burnet.

warrant. With Latimer, who has often (but not always judiciously) alluded to the case of Seymour, he seems to have agreed in thus admitting that such an attainder, as that of the admiral had been, "[1] might be done rarely, upon some great respect to the commonwealth, for avoiding of greater tumult and peril."

The fate of Seymour, indeed, awakened the zeal of Cranmer's fellow-labourer, not only to offer a character of the sufferer, but therewith a reflection also upon sectaries that were now impeding the progress of the Reformation, and, with others, had excited, as we shall presently find, the attention of the government. These are the words of Latimer. "[2] I have heard say, when that good queen that is gone, (he means Catharine Parr, who married Seymour, after the death of Henry,) had ordained in her house daily prayer, both before noon and after noon, the admiral gets him out of the way, like a mole digging in the earth. He shall be Lot's wife to me as long as I live. He was, I heard say, a covetous man: a covetous man indeed; I would there were no more in England. He was, I heard say, an ambitious man; I would there were no more in England. He was, I heard say, a seditious man, a contemner of common prayer; I would there were no more in Eng-

[1] Sermon before King Edward, April 5, 1549.

[2] Sermon before King Edward, April 19, 1549.

land; well, he is gone, I would he had left none behind him. Remember you, my lords, that you pray in your houses to the better mortification of your flesh. Remember, God must be honoured. I will you to pray, that God will continue His Spirit to you. I do not put you in comfort, that if ye have once the Spirit, ye cannot lose it. There be new spirits started up now of late, that say, after we have received the Spirit we cannot sin. I will make but one argument: St. Paul had brought the Galatians to the profession of the faith, and left them in that state: they had received the Spirit once, but they sinned again, as he testified of them himself: he saith, *Ye did run well,* (ch. v. 7.) ye were once in a right state; and again, *Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?* Once they had the Spirit by faith, but false prophets came, when he was gone from them, and they plucked them clean away from all that Paul had planted them in; and then said Paul unto them, *O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you?* If this be true, we may lose the Spirit that we have once possessed."

With the liberty of the Gospel, many new and wild opinions indeed had been circulated and defended. By foreigners, who were come over into England, the tenets of Anabaptism also were [1] now

[1] See before, vol. i. p. 255. There apppeared in this year

again industriously disseminated. To the Council the following[1] notions of the sectaries were, therefore, in the Spring of 1549, represented: that children, baptized in infancy, should afterwards be rebaptized; that the baptism of infants was altogether unprofitable; that all things were and ought to be in common; that the elect sinned not, and could not sin; that though the outward man sinned, the inward man sinned not; that upon the divine decree[2] of predestination, the blame of all sins was to be laid; that repentance could not restore sinners to grace; that there was no Trinity of persons in the Godhead; that Christ was only a holy prophet, and not God; and that he was not incarnate of the Virgin Mary. Against such as were suspected or accused of these heresies, [3] proceedings, similar to those against the Anabaptists in 1538, were entrusted to [4] commissioners; among whom were the archbishop, six other prelates, some inferior divines, and with other distinguished laymen Cecil and Sir Thomas Smith. Such too, as should oppose

(1549) "A short instruction for to arme all good Christian people against the pestiferous errours of the common secte of Anabaptistes." Translated from the compilation of John Calvin, and printed by Day.

[1] Burnet. Strype. [2] Heylin, 73.

[3] See before, vol. i. p. 256.

[4] Burnet, and Collier, vol. ii. Pref. p. 12. where the commission is copied. It is dated April 12. [1549.]

or defame the new form of Common Prayer, the commissioners were also required to examine, and to reclaim or punish.

Before them several persons were immediately summoned, of whom some were led to abjure their dangerous opinions, and were sworn not to return to them. But among the accused there was one, whom neither persuasion nor threat could induce to depart from the errors that had been adopted. This was Joan Bocher, or Bourchier, usually called Joan of Kent, who denied the humanity of Christ. She was tried and condemned.

Upon the character of Cranmer this proceeding has been generally pronounced an indelible stain. The sentence against her required the royal signature to confirm it, which is said to have been obtained, not without the greatest reluctance. But, in Edward's own journal of occurrences, we find no other mention of the proceeding, than that "[1] on the second of May [1550] she was burnt for holding that Christ was not incarnate of the Virgin Mary; being condemned the year before, but kept in hope of conversion; and on the 30th of April the bishop of London [Ridley] and the bishop of Ely [Goodrich] were to persuade her; but she withstood them, and reviled the preacher at her death." Cranmer is

[1] Burnet, ii. Rec. p. 12.

not even named. Foxe, however, tells us that Edward "always spared and favoured the life of man, as in a certain dissertation of his once appeared, had with Master Cheke, in favouring the life of heretics; insomuch that, when Joan Bocher should be burned, all the Council could not move him to put to his hand, but were fain to get Dr. Cranmer to persuade with him, and yet neither could he, with much labour, induce the king so to do, saying, What, my Lord, will you have me to send her quick to the devil in her error? So that Dr. Cranmer himself confessed, that he never had so much to do in all his life, as to cause the king to put to his hand, saying that he would lay all the charge thereof upon Cranmer before God." Cranmer is represented as having argued from the law of Moses, by which blasphemers were to be stoned, and as having thus wrested from the young sovereign his consent to the execution of the [1] fanatical woman. By no contemporary writer has the narrative of Foxe been impugned. Sir John Hayward soon afterwards repeated it, affirming that Cranmer was not only "[2] *violent* with the king, by persuasions and entreaties," to seal the fatal warrant, but "that it might be his *importunity of blood*, by

[1] Burnet considers her as insane. Lewis is of the same opinion. Hist. of Eng. Anabaptists, 1738, p. 50.

[2] In his Life and Reign of Edw. VI.

which this woman was burnt, that he himself afterwards felt the smart of fire." Strype has endeavoured to exculpate the archbishop. "[1] The character drawn by Hayward," he says, "is utterly disagreeable from Cranmer's spirit. For none was more tender of blood than he; none more pitiful and compassionate. Nor was he a man for rigorous methods and violent courses. Indeed Foxe mentions, that the Council put Cranmer upon moving the king to sign the warrant; which was a sign he had no forwardness to it himself. And in obedience to them he did labour with the king about it, and obtained it. And though he did this, it neither argued *violence* nor *importunity of blood.* For as *he was* [2] *not present at her condemnation, as appears by the council-book,* so he may be concluded to have had no desire of her death, though the warrant by his means was signed for her execution. His thoughts, I am apt to think were, that the fear of death which

[1] Ecc. Mem. ii. 473.

[2] And yet several modern writers have pretended that she told Cranmer in particular, that *he* was about to *condemn* her for a piece of flesh, as *he had condemned* Anne Askew for a piece of bread, *at whose condemnation he was also not present.* See before, vol. i. p. 374. Sanders would not have omitted the personal address of Bocher to the Archbishop, if it had been true: he relates it, as applied to the whole of the commissioners before whom she appeared, whom in his first edition (1585) he denominates *Calvinists,* in his second (1586) *Zuinglians.*

she saw so near, might serve to reclaim her from her error, when his and other learned men's reasonings with *her, being both ignorant and obstinate,* were ineffectual."

[1] The modern historian of the Reformation contends, " that for the remarkable statement of Foxe, no voucher is adduced, and, therefore, it may be nothing more than a report current when the martyrologist wrote. He was likely to have felt little hesitation in committing such a report to paper, because he, no doubt, cordially detested the unhappy Bocher's heterodoxy, and because he was probably irritated by the practice of affecting to confound Protestants with heretics, which was general among Romanists. The value of Foxe's work, which is immense, rests, it should be observed, upon the vast mass of authentic documents and contemporary testimony which he has printed. In his unauthenticated relations he may sometimes have fallen into error. That he has done so in his account of Edward's conduct respecting Joan Bocher, is rendered highly probable by the king's silence. Had the extraordinary dialogue attributed to him and Cranmer ever taken place, it is not easy to account for its omission in the royal diary. Of any such dialogue Sanders appears to have been ignorant, for he has not inserted the least allusion to it; al-

[1] Soames, Hist. Ref. iii. 544.

though he has mentioned invidiously, as he was fairly warranted in doing, the burning of the [1] two heretics, and the taunt which Bocher addressed to her judges on the score of [2] Anne Askew's case. Of the part which Cranmer really took in the affair of Joan Bocher, nothing is known beyond the facts, that he presided judicially at her trial, and that he endeavoured, in company with Ridley, to shake her opinion, in several subsequent interviews, while she was detained at the house in Smithfield, then occupied by lord Rich, the chancellor, and lately the priory of St. Bartholomew. His dislike to the shedding of blood must be inferred from the mildness of his disposition, and is rendered undeniable by [3] known facts. Dr. Lingard, in mentioning the burning of this woman, says, that Cranmer was compelled to moot the point with the young (royal) theologian. He does not, however, attribute to the king the speeches which are in Foxe, and in most other histories. The

[1] Van Paris is the other heretic here intended, of whom further mention is presently made.

[2] See the account of Askew's case, and what is there said of the archbishop, in the present Life of him, vol. i. pp. 374, 375.

[3] The learned historian refers to the archbishop's wish to have saved Frith from the stake, and to his mildness in the proceedings against Lambert, in the propriety of whose sentence we have no means of knowing how far Cranmer might have concurred. Hist. Ref. ii. 333. See also p. 40, in the present volume.

whole account of this *mooting* is, in fact, unsupported by evidence, and when all the known circumstances of the case are considered, it appears by no means probable."

Gilpin, in his Life of Cranmer, observes, however, that "[1] nothing even plausible can be suggested in defence of the archbishop on this occasion, except only, that the [2] spirit of popery was not yet wholly repressed;" a spirit, the elegant biographer might have added, which the archbishop, in regard to such modes of persecution, seems in his heart to have disclaimed; for in 1551 he tells Gardiner, "[3] that the truth hath been hid these many years, and persecuted by the papists *with fire and fagot, and should be so yet still, if you might have your own will.*" It is remarkable too, that Gardiner, who, in his controversy with him, denounces "[4] the rude, the

[1] Life of Cranmer, p. 132.

[2] See Bossuet's Hist. des Variations, &c. who scruples not thus to describe his own Church, l. 10. p. 51. ed. Paris, 1740. "L'exercise de la puissance, &c. viz. As to the exercise and use of the power of the sword in matters of religion and of conscience, it is a point not to be called in question:—the right of it is certain. There is no illusion more dangerous than to consider toleration as a mark and character of the true Church!" Transl. by Archdeacon Churton, Life of Bishop Smyth, Pref. 1800, p. 139.

[3] Cranmer's Answer to Gardiner, ed. 1580, p. 265.

[4] Gardiner's Explication of the true catholique fayth, &c. 1551, fol. 28.

pestilent heresy, wherein Joan of Ken obstinately died," reminds him not either then, or at any subsequent time, of his activity in pursuing to the stake either her or Van Paris. If, however, as Foxe relates it, he became the vassal of a bloody Council, in urging their desire to the sovereign, his constitutional timidity, I am persuaded, thus misled him. If Edward, too, bade him notice that unwillingly the signature was made in submission to his authority, and that upon him the responsibility of it to heaven should rest, it is no wonder that he, who had been persuaded to contend for unjustifiable cruelty, should "[1] be struck with horror" at the remonstrance, and that, therefore, "[2] he was very unwilling to have the sentence executed." It is to be lamented, that he did not oppose the sentence being passed.

But his enemies, in order to heap redoubled shame upon his memory, have represented him as resorting to the king with importunity also for the punishment of George Van Paris, a Dutchman, who, in the next year, suffered for denying the divinity of Christ. The pages also of some of his friends are stained with this misrepresentation. "[3] The young king," says the Romish biographer of Cardinal Pole, "shewed a reluc-

[1] Burnet. [2] Ibid.

[3] Philips, Life of Cardinal Pole, 8vo. ed. ii. 209.

tance to sign the warrant for the execution of these wretches," Van Paris and Bocher; but "Cranmer solved his scruples, and prevailed on him to put his hand to it." Nor is this aggravation questioned by a Protestant biographer of Cranmer, who describes him "[1] not only consenting to these acts of blood, but even persuading the aversion of the young king into a compliance, and thus informing his royal pupil's conscience: Your Majesty must distinguish between common opinions and such as are essential articles of faith: These latter we must on no account suffer to be opposed." A late prelate of the Church of Rome prefaces the accusation with an account, as unjust as it is rancorous, of the archbishop "[2] being instrumental, during the reign of Henry, in bringing to the stake [3] Lambert, [4] Askew, [5] Frith, and [6] Allen, besides condemning

[1] Gilpin, Life of Cranmer, 131.

[2] Dr. Milner, End of Relig. Controversy, Lett. 49.

[3] That he addressed Lambert with great mildness, his own words convince us; that he wished to atone for his concurrence in the prosecution of him, we have also his own testimony. See before, vol. i. pp. 259, 261, 265. See also in the present vol. p. 40, where his exertions *to save the lives of papists* are noticed.

[4] In the case of Askew there appears nothing to implicate Cranmer. See before, vol. i. p. 374.

[5] Cranmer was desirous to save Frith. See before, vol. i. p. 86.

[6] Of Allen I know nothing.

a great many others to it, for denying the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament; and of his continuing during the reign of Edward, to convict Arians and Anabaptists capitally, and to press for their execution; two of whom, Joan Bocher and Van Paris, he got actually burnt, preventing the young king from pardoning them, by telling him that princes, being God's deputies, ought to punish impieties against Him."

Of any especial interference by Cranmer, in regard to Van Paris, there is, however, no contemporary statement, no evidence. The legal process and sentence against the Dutchman were certainly the same as in the case of Bocher; and of those proceedings a certificate, as the law then required, was delivered to the king, to whose power and direction the punishment was left, but whose scruples are not again reported, either by Foxe or any of our old writers, to have upbraided the archbishop as forgetful of mercy. But again he had not courage to swim against the stream. "[1] However we may condemn him for this, as I do most heartily," a learned divine of our church has said, "it will still be true, that amidst the violent prejudices, and cruel principles, derived chiefly from the old religion, such men on either side as More or Cranmer, who being placed in the

[1] Dr. Sturges's Reflections on Popery, in answer to Dr. Milner's History of Winchester, second edition, pp. 145, 146.

most trying circumstances more than compensated infirmities, then *common* to all, by virtues almost *peculiar* to themselves, should be regarded by us with indulgence and respect."

The arrest of lord Seymour, we have seen, preceded the trial of Joan Bocher a few weeks. Not many months after it had elapsed, when the public saw his ducal brother, the Protector Somerset, fall also from his high estate. Factions in the Council had prevailed against him, when he removed the king from Hampton Court to Windsor, and seemed determined there to oppose the conspiracy to the utmost extremity. By the malcontent councillors he was charged as regardless of their opinion and advice, and therefore as the author of much public grievance. His [1] conduct in regard to the demands of the rebellious peasantry as to inclosures; his introduction of foreign troops into the king's service; his great wealth obtained by the spoliation of church property; were, with many other accusations now alleged, to prepare the way for the entire overthrow of his power. By the Reformers, his measures, in promoting their views, were now not remembered as they deserved. By the Roman Catholic party, who fondly expected to find in his dissembling and still more ambitious successor, the earl of Warwick, a friend to their cause, he was detested.

[1] See before, p. 72.

In the defection of his fellow-councillors, Cranmer, Sir William Paget, and Sir Thomas Smith, however, were not joined. They followed him to Windsor. Hoping to avert his downfall, they addressed a letter to the rest of the Council, (in answer to one which from them they had received,) which is [1] believed to have been penned by Cranmer. It is not printed either by Burnet or Strype. An address, so mild and wise, which indeed "[2] breathes all the spirit of Cranmer in its genuine nature," deserves to be now produced [3] entire from the ancient pages in which it is recorded.

"[4] After our hearty commendations unto your good lordships. We have received from the same a letter by Master Hunnings, dated at London yesterday, whereby you do us to understand the causes of your assemble there; and, charging the lord Protector with the manner of government, require that he withdraw himself from the king's Majesty, disperse the force which he hath levied, and be contented to be ordered according to justice and reason. And so you will gladly commune with us, as touching the surety of the king's Majesty's person, and the order of all other things,

[1] Strype evidently considers the archbishop as the sole writer of the letter. Life of Cranmer, B. 2, ch. 12.

[2] Turner, Hist. Edw. VI. 176.

[3] Strype and Turner cite a few lines of it; Burnet, none.

[4] Stow, Chronicle, 4to. edition, 1009.

with such conformity on that behalf as appertaineth; and otherwise you must, as you write, make other account of us than you trust to have cause and burden of us, if things come to extemities.

"To the first point, we verily believe that, as bruits, rumours, and reports that your lordships intended the destruction of the lord Protector induced his grace to fly to the defence which he hath assembled, excuse your lordships, hearing that his grace intended the like destruction towards you, having been moved to do as you have done; so as, for lack of understanding one another's right meaning, things be grown to such extremities, as if the saving of the king's Majesty's person, and the common weal, take not more place in his grace and your lordships than private respects or affairs, you see, we doubt not, as we do, that both our king, our country, and also ourselves, shall, as verily as God is God, be utterly destroyed and cast away. Wherefore, might it please you, for the tender passion of Jesus Christ, use your wisdom and temper your determination in such sort, as no blood be shed, nor cruelty used, neither of his grace's part, nor of your lordships'. For if it come to that point, both you and we are like to see presently with our eyes that which every vein of all our hearts will bleed to behold.

"Wherefore as true subjects to the king's Majesty, as faithful though unworthy councillors to

his Majesty and the realm, and as lamentable petitioners, we beseech your lordships most humbly, and from the bottom of our hearts, to take pity of the king, and the realm whereof you are principal members; and to set apart *summum jus*, and to use at this time *tum bonum et æquum*. And think not that this is written for any private fear, or other respect of ourselves, but for that undoubtedly we here know [1] more of this point (with your favour) than you there do know. Yea, and howsoever it shall please you to account of us, we are true to God, to the king, to the realm, and so will we live and die wheresoever we be; and, in respect to those three, esteem little any other person or thing, no, not our own lives; and having clear consciences, as to whatsoever ill may follow upon the use of extremity there, that neither now is nor shall be found fault in us. And, so quieting ourselves, we rest.

"Now to that you would have the lord Protector to do, for his part his grace and we have communed herein, and much to our comforts, and your's also, if you like to weigh the case. He is contented, if you will again for your parts use

[1] Probably Cranmer meant, says Strype, who merely alludes to this part of the letter, that he knew that this anger against the duke arose from the private malice of some of them, or their hatred of the Reformation, notwithstanding all the fair pretences of their care for the king, and of the Protector's misgovernment.

equity to put that now in execution, which many times he hath declared by his words; that is to say, so as the king and the realm may be otherwise well served, he [1] passeth little for the place he now hath. Marry, he doth consider that by the king's Majesty with all your advices, and the consent of the nobles of the realm, he was called to the place; as appeareth in writing under his Majesty's great seal and sign, whereunto your own hands also and our's, with all other of the lords of the upper house in parliament are subscribed. And therefore in violent sort to be thus thrust out against his will, he thinketh it not reasonable. He is here with the king's person, where his place is to be; and here we are with him, we trust in God, for the service of the king, the weal of the realm, and the good acquitting both of his grace and your lordships, which we most heartily desire, and see such hope here thereof, as if you are not too sore bent upon the extremities, as is reported, and so as equity can take no place, my lord's grace may live in quiet, and the king's Majesty's affairs be maintained in such order as by his Majesty's councillors shall be thought convenient. Marry, to put himself simply into your hands, having heard both as we and he have,

[1] Regardeth, careth. This sense of *pass* is now obsolete.

"As for those silken-coated slaves, I *pass* not."

SHAKSPEARE, KING HENRY VI. P. II.

without first knowledge upon what conditions, it is not reasonable.

"Life is sweet, my lords; and they say, you seek his blood and his death: which if you do, and may have him otherwise conformable to reason, and by extremity drive him to seek extremity again, the blood of him and others that shall die on both sides innocently shall be by God justly required at your hands. And when peradventure you would have him again upon occasion of service, you shall forethink to have lost him. Wherefore, good my lords, we beseech you again and again, if you have conceived any such determination, to put it out of your heads, and incline your hearts to kindness and humanity; remembering that he hath never been cruel to any of you, and why should you be cruel to him, as we trust you be not, whatsoever hath been said, but will shew yourselves as conformable for your parts, as his grace is contented for the zeal he beareth to the king and the realm to be for his part; as the bearer of this, Sir Philip Hoby, will declare unto you, to whom we pray you to give credit, and to return him hither again with answer hereof. And thus beseeching the living God to direct your hearts to the working of a quiet end of these terrible tumults, we bid your worships most heartily well to fare. From the king's Majesty's Castle of Windsor, the [1] eighth of October, 1549."

[1] On this day "a proclamation was set forth by the state

The answer of the lords, who had deserted Somerset, occasioned the delay of their plan only a a few days; for on the twelfth of October they came to Windsor, and on the fourteenth conducted him thence a prisoner to the Tower. He acknowledged the numerous offences with which he was charged, and humbly implored a pardon. In the following February he was indeed released from his confinement, but deprived of the protectorate; and in April was restored to a seat in the Council. During eighteen months this conciliation lasted. On new charges he was then again arrested. His objects, it was stated, were to regain by treasonable means the power he had lost; and to assassinate his successor in that power, Warwick, afterwards advanced to the dukedom of Northumberland. Of the treasonable accusation he was acquitted: of the felonious he was convicted, and that brought him to the block. While in his first imprisonment, he appears to have profited by a little treatise translated from the German, by Miles Coverdale, the friend of Cranmer, probably at Cranmer's request, by whom too, we may believe it to have been recommended to his noble friend. The title of the little volume, which has often been reprinted, is "A spiritual and precious pearl, teaching all men to live and embrace the

and bodie of the king's maiesties counsayle, now assembled at London, conteyning the very trouth of the duke of Somerset's evel governme nt, and false and detestable proceedinges."

Cross, as a most sweet and necessary thing unto the soul; and what comfort is to be taken thereof, and also where and how both consolation, and aid, in all manner of afflictions, is to be sought." By some writers the duke is said to have procured the translation of the original into English. Others have attributed to him the whole composition. He certainly wrote a preface to an edition of the book, in the May after he was released: but therein he appears to admit that the copy of the work, which he had read, was in *our own language*. Of the author thus he speaks, in the true spirit of a Reformer: "This man, whosoever he be that was the [1] first author of this book, goeth the right way to work: *he bringeth his ground from God's Word.*—In our great trouble, which of late did happen unto us, (as all the world doth know,) when it pleased God for a time to attempt us with his scourge, and to prove if we loved Him, in reading this book we did find great comfort.—And hereupon we have required him, of whom we had the copy of this book, to set it forth in print." To this edition, in the year 1550, was subjoined, "A humble petition to the Lord, practised in the common prayer of the whole family at Shene, during the trouble of their lord and master, the duke of Somerset; gathered and set forth by

[1] Otho Wermylierus, a learned German preacher at Zurich. Ames, 262. Dibdin, iv. 298.

Thomas Becon, minister there." Becon was another of Cranmer's friends, and eminent among our Reformers.

But while the duke was a prisoner in 1549, Calvin addressed "an epistle of godly consolation" to him, not because of his misfortune, but "[1] before the time or knowledge had of his trouble, yet delivered to him during that time," in which he translated the letter, which was in French, into English, and allowed it to be published in April 1550. The hours of his confinement were also rendered less irksome by a long [2] consolatory epistle from Peter Martyr. The Reformers then trembled indeed for the cause which he had supported. To that cause he continued firm to the last. When on the scaffold, he reminded the spectators of the religion, "[3] which so long as I was in authority," said he, "I always diligently set forth and furthered to my power. Neither repent I of my doings, but rejoice therein, since now the state of Christian religion cometh most near unto the form and order of the Primitive Church; which thing I esteem as a great benefit, given of God both unto you and me, most heartily exhorting you all that this, which is most purely set forth unto you, you will with like thankfulness accept

[1] Ames, 207. Dibdin, iii. 495. Calvin's letter is dated October 22, 1549.

[2] Burnet. [3] Foxe.

and embrace, and set out the same in your living."

Besides Cranmer and those who favoured the Reformation, the lower classes in general were warmly attached to Somerset. He was the poor man's friend. To hear and redress their grievances, was one of the honours of his administration. His enemies cavilled even at this good work. "Great clamour was raised against him," as lord Orford [1] gathers it from Strype, "*for a merit of the most beautiful nature;* this was his setting up a court of requests in his own house, to hear the petitions and suits of poor men; and upon the compassion he took of their oppressions; if he ended not their business, he would send his letters to chancery in their favour."

[1] Eccl. Mem. ii. 183. Royal and Noble Authors, i. 285.

CHAPTER VII.

1549 to 1550.

The old missals and other service-books called in—The new form of ordaining bishops, priests, and deacons—Ponet, the first prelate consecrated by it—Account of him, and of his work, entitled Defence of the Marriages of Priests—Letter to Cranmer on the Celibacy of the Clergy—The Epistles of Ignatius referred to on the subject—Cranmer's and Ridley's treatises against Roman Catholic traditions—Treatise of Bertram against Transubstantiation—Treatises against the Mass—The Book of Herman, archbishop of Cologne—Destruction of libraries—Leland, Bale, and Cranmer.

ELATED as the Romanists were when the power of Somerset was first humbled, they were also induced to think, that then there would be no impediment to the return of services and rituals that had been forbidden. By his influence only, they considered the new service-book to have been enacted. Cranmer immediately prepared to suppress their hopes; and occasioned a letter to be sent at Christmas, by the king and Council to the

bishops, of which [1] himself, there can be little doubt, was the author, and which announced the sovereign's unaltered determination against the Romish formularies. An Act, at the beginning of the year 1550, confirmed this proclamation, with [2] penalties of disobedience to it; and secured the reformed liturgy, during the reign of Edward, against further opposition by the Roman Catholic party. Though the Book of Common Prayer was commanded to be used of all persons within the realm, "[3] We are nevertheless informed," Cranmer writes in the name of the king and Council, "that divers unquiet and evil-disposed persons, *since the apprehension of the duke of Somerset,* have noised and bruited abroad, that they should have again their old Latin service, their conjured bread and water, with such-like vain and superfluous ceremonies, *as though the setting forth of the said Book had been the only act of the said duke:* We, therefore, by the advice of the body and state of our Privy Council, not only considering the said Book to be our Act, and the Act of the whole of our realm assembled together in parliament, but also the same be grounded upon the Holy Scrip-

[1] The letter is in Cranmer's Register, Lamb. Lib. fol. 56. Heylin calls it "the missive of the archbishop," 78.

[2] A fine for the first and second offence in keeping any of the prohibited books; imprisonment during the king's pleasure for the third.

[3] Burnet, Rec. ii. B. i. No. 47.

ture, agreeable to the order of the Primitive Church, and much to the re-edifying of our subjects; to put away all such vain expectation of having the public service, the administration of the sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies, again in the Latin tongue, which were but a preferment of ignorance to knowledge, and darkness to light, and a preparation to bring in papistry and superstition again; have thought good, by the advice aforesaid, to require, and nevertheless straitly do command and charge you, that immediately upon the receipt hereof, you do command the dean and prebendaries of your cathedral church, and the parson, vicar, or curate, and churchwardens of every parish within your diocese, to bring and deliver unto you, or your deputy, at such convenient place as you shall appoint, all Antiphonals, Missals, Grails, Processionals, Manuals, Legends, Pies, Portasses, Journals, and Ordinals, after the use of Sarum, Lincoln, York, or any other private use; and all other books of service, the keeping whereof should be a let to the using of the said Book of Common Prayers; and that you take the same books into your hands, or into the hands of your deputy, and them so deface and abolish, that they never after may serve either to any such use as they were provided for, or be at any time a let to that godly and uniform Order, which by a common consent is now set forth. And if you shall find

any person stubborn, or disobedient, in not bringing in the said books according to the tenor of these our letters, that then ye commit the said person to ward, until such time as you have certified us of his misbehaviour. And We will and command you, that you also search, or cause search to be made, from time to time, whether any book be withdrawn or hid, contrary to the tenor of these our letters; and the same book to receive into your hands, and to use all such as in these our letters we have appointed. And further, whereas it is come unto our knowledge, that divers froward and obstinate persons do refuse to pay towards the finding of bread and wine for the holy communion, according to the Order prescribed in the said Book, by reason whereof the holy communion is many times omitted upon the Sunday; these are to will and command you to convent such obstinate persons before you, and them to admonish and command to keep the Order prescribed in the said Book; and if any shall refuse so to do, to punish them by suspension, excommunication, or other censures of the Church."

The [1] Primer of 1545 was allowed, by the statute which followed this proclamation, still to be kept and used; the invocation or prayer to saints in it being first obliterated. Images yet remaining in churches, while respect was paid to the

[1] See before, vol. i. p. 373.

monumental figures of persons represented not as saints, the statute ordered to be defaced and destroyed.

After a new form it was now resolved, that bishops, priests, and deacons, should be ordained. An Act was accordingly passed, not without opposition to it by the bishops of Durham, Carlisle, Worcester, Chichester, and Westminster, which consigned to six prelates and divines the preparation of this ritual. Heath, bishop of Worcester, one of those appointed to the work, as he had objected to the passing of the statute for this purpose, so now he [1] refused to comply with the directions of it; and for his disobedience, was in March (1549-50) sent by the Council to the Fleet. The rest, under the [2] guidance of Cranmer, before the close of that month, produced the Ordinal, which then was [3] separately published, and afterwards subjoined to the second liturgy of Edward. They concluded that the orders of bishop, priest, and deacon, were those only which are of aposto-

[1] Burnet says, that Heath had hitherto opposed every thing done towards the Reformation in parliament, though he had given an entire obedience to it when it was enacted; and that he was a man of a gentle temper, and great prudence. See Cranmer's character of him in the present work, vol. i. p. 148. He is said to have understood affairs of state better than matters of religion.

[2] The chief of them, no doubt, was the archbishop. Strype.

[3] Printed by Grafton.

lical institution; and that by the episcopal authority all the three orders are conferred, thus conforming to the practice of the ancient Church, which never accounted an ordination valid that was performed by persons beneath the episcopal character. They distinguished also the two higher orders of bishops and priests; and while they pronounced the forms of ordination, as mentioned in Scripture, to be only the imposition of hands and prayer, they directed that two bishops should expressly declare, that the person presented is to be consecrated to *their own order;* and to him are accordingly applied more questions by the archbishop, than are mentioned in the office for ordaining priests, implying the superior authority of one who was to exercise discipline, and to govern a diocese. They rejected the inferior orders of acolyths, sub-deacons, and readers, which had been the provision of modern ages, and were still retained in the Church of Rome; and they discontinued some unmeaning ceremonies. By this reformed ritual Ponet was the first prelate [1] consecrated. He was a scholar of no ordinary character; the intimate friend of Ridley and of Ascham; as a preacher, and as an author, both in Latin and English, eminently promoting the Reformation. He had now published his Defence of the Marriages of Priests; which in the time of Mary was

[1] To the see of Rochester, Ridley being translated to that of London.

abused, in a work that bore the name of [1] Martin in its title-page, but of which Ponet, in a reply to it, pronounced Gardiner, and Dr. Smith, the deceitful adversary of Cranmer, if not other Romanists also, the authors. Smith had written an especial treatise, indeed, to maintain the law of celibacy on the clergy by the Church of Rome, which Peter Martyr had impugned. He printed it at Louvain, whither he had fled. Having however [2] recanted, soon after the accession of Edward, what as a Romanist he had said of the mass, he now was willing to retract what he had written on the law of priestly celibacy; acknowledging, in a letter to Cranmer, "[3] his sudden and unadvised departing from his grace over the sea; and desiring, of his charity towards them that repent of their ill acts, to forgive him all the wrong he had done, and to obtain for him the king's pardon, upon the receipt of which he would return again home, and within half a year (at the uttermost) afterward write a book *de sacerdotum connubiis,* &c. a Latin book *(on the marriage of priests)* that should be a just satisfaction for *any that he had written against the same.*" To this letter the archbishop paid no regard; though Smith threatens in it also to attack his book on the Sacrament. The writer of it remained in exile. Burnet has given an [4] account of com-

[1] See before, vol. i. p. 5.

[2] At Paul's Cross, 15th May, 1547.

[3] Letter to Cranmer, printed by Foxe in his Life of Latimer.

[4] Hist. Ref. under the year 1551.

plaints having at this time been preferred against him by the University of Oxford to the Council, and of his having been imprisoned till he obtained his release by means of Cranmer, to whom he sent an acknowledgment of the kindness with a reference also to the connubial topic. But the historian has here [1] mistakenly introduced Cranmer into a transaction, which passed only between Smith and archbishop Parker some years afterwards; when Smith, having again returned to Romanism in the reign of Mary, was at the beginning of Elizabeth's [2] certainly incarcerated, but on giving security for his good conduct was by Parker restored to liberty, and presently again fled from his country. Meantime, with thanks to Parker, he hypocritically observed "[3] that he had written his book *de cœlibatu sacerdotum* to try the truth out, not to the intent that it should be printed, as it was against his will. Would to God (he said) I had never made it; because I took then for my chief ground, *that the priests of England made a vow* (of celibacy) *when they were made* (priests,) *which now I perceive is not true.*" Anthony Wood, in his Life of Smith, has adopted the mistake of Burnet; relating that

[1] This, and another letter, a learned correspondent of Burnet assured him, were addressed to Parker, and not to Cranmer; which, if the historian doubted, he offered to make very evident. They are among the MSS. C. C. Camb. Hist. Ref. vol. iii. *Corrections.*

[2] A. Wood, Ath. Ox. *Smith.*

[3] MSS. C. C. Camb. Burnet, ii. Rec. B. i. No. 54, as if to Cranmer, but it is certainly to Parker.

Smith thus wrote to Cranmer, because he had heard of collections made by the archbishop in opposition to his book. Such indeed were the collections of Parker, whose Defence of the Marriages of Priests, especially levelled against Martin's treatise, appeared in 1562. Burnet considers Cranmer when he should have named Parker, I must further observe, as "inquiring after a manuscript of the *Epistles of Ignatius*." But the historian assigns no reason for such an inquiry; which however, as it relates to a subject that had so much engaged the attention of both the archbishops, as well as of the foreign Reformers, the ancient usage of the Christian Church in allowing the priesthood to marry, claims especial notice. The charge of these Epistles having been corruptly printed had, perhaps, reached the ears of Parker. Martin in his treatise, in 1554, brought such an accusation against the foreign friends of Cranmer. "[1] The Germans," said he, "corrupting Ignatius, have put in him *St. Paul for a married man*, whereas I have seen other written books to the contrary: And that no man may think me to speak an untruth, I report me to the testimony of a number of good students that have been fellows of *Magdalen College in Oxford*, whether they have not in their library an old written copy of Ignatius, [2] except some brother hath of late

[1] Treatise, &c. 1554. sign. Z. iii. b.

[2] This illiberal insinuation appears to be overthrown by the statement, long afterwards, of such a manuscript then being in the library of Magdalen College. See the Catal. Libb. MSS.

years stolen it away, *where St. Paul's name is not written.*" This assertion the very learned Dr. James, in his Introduction to Divinity, published at Oxford in 1625, has denied. The name of St. Paul as a married man, "*is, or was, extant,*" he says, "*in this manuscript.*" He had thus seen it also in other manuscripts. The statement is, that [1] St. Peter and St. Paul, and other Apostles, were married. "[2] *That this passage, was not corrupted since the Reformation, appears from various editions made before that time:* And that it is *genuine,* may be seen in Usher, Dissert. in Ignatium, c. 17, and Cotelerius, Annot. in locum."

A brief, but important literary labour of the archbishop had now been circulated, maintaining the great principle of the Reformation, that the whole of God's Word is contained in Scripture, or the Written Word. Tradition, called by Romanists the Unwritten Word of God, by them was held of equal authority with the Written Word. Cranmer, therefore, collected sufficient proofs against this elevation of tradition to a level with inspiration; and exposed many of the *Un-*

Ang. et Heb. Ox. 1697, No. 2217, Codices MSS. Coll. S. Mariæ Magdalenæ.

[1] Petrus, et Paulus, et reliqui Apostoli, nuptiis fuerunt associati, &c. Ignat. ad Philadelph. edit. Vossii.

Essay on the Law of Celibacy imposed on the Clergy of the Roman Catholic Church, by the Rev. J. Hawkins, Worcester, pp. 9, 10.

written Verities, as they were called, which were pretended to have been left by the Apostles. In his additional notes upon the subject, he says, "[1] What things came by traditions from the Apostles, no man can tell certainly; and if we be bound to receive them as articles of our faith, then is our faith uncertain, for we are [thus] bound to believe we know not what." Strype considers the archbishop's treatise as published [2] first in Latin, about the beginning of Edward's reign; as "[3] nibbled at by Smith, in his book of traditions, which he recanted;" and as [4] translated into English for common use, with the title of *Unwritten Verities*, in 1548. In the reign of Mary, another translation of it appeared, which is said to have been made by an English exile; which also refers to "[5] the trickes of the holy maide of Lymster, lame woman of St. Alban's, visions of Mrs. Anne Wentworth, and [6] Elizabeth Barton, the holy maide of Courtop-street, in Kent." Ridley had also written a "[7] learned comparison between the comfortable doctrine of the Gospel,

[1] Strype, Ecc. Mem. ii. 138. [2] Ibid. 136.

[3] Life of Cranm. B. 2, ch. 5.

[4] Ecc. Mem. ii. 136. Strype in his Appendix has printed this translation.

[5] Ames, 229. [6] See before, vol. i. p. 90.

[7] Dibdin, Typogr. Antiq. iv. 286. This posthumous work of Ridley was printed by W. Powell, in 1566.

and the traditions of the popish religion;" which, however, was not published till ten years after his martyrdom.

In 1549 [1] certainly, if not also in 1548, another remarkable little treatise appeared, which denied transubstantiation to be a doctrine of the ancient Catholic Church. It was the translation of a Latin work, upon which [2] Ridley had communicated his thoughts to Cranmer in 1546; "the boke of Barthram, priest, intreatinge of the bodye and bloode of Christe, wrytten to great Charles the emperoure, and set forth seven hundred years ago." Bertram, or (as he is also called) Ratramnus, was a monk of the abbey of Corby, in the ninth century. His book is an answer to Paschasius Radbert, who had been of the same fraternity, and who asserted a carnal or bodily presence of Christ in the sacrament. Bertram contends for a spiritual presence only; maintaining our doctrine, [3] Burnet has observed, as expressly as we Protestants ourselves can do; delivering it in the same words, and proving it by many of the same authorities which we bring. The translation [4] has

[1] Ames mentions an edition both in 1548 and 1549; the former printed by T. Raynald, the latter by A. Kitson. Dr. Dibdin thinks Ames mistaken as to an edition of 1548.

[2] See before, vol. i. p. 266.

[3] In his exposition of the Twenty-eighth Article of Religion.

[4] By the editor of the work, Lat. and Eng. Lond. in 1686. Ridley in his conference with secretary Bourne in the Tower,

been supposed to have been made by Ridley, or by his advice. To the accustomed zeal of Cranmer for exhibiting, in the vernacular tongue, the most valuable information, I am rather inclined to ascribe it. It is royally privileged, and is printed in a small form, but in types usually given to books of a larger size; as if it had been especially intended to gratify the eye of age, as well as youth. The foreign Protestants had published the original at Cologne, in 1532, and at Geneva in 1541. Often they have since re-printed it. The Cologne impression so staggered many learned Romanists abroad, that they affected to pronounce the work a modern forgery of the Protestants. Gardiner, in his controversy with Cranmer, [1] resorted to a like suspicion of its credit. It was in 1549, however, put into the Romish *Index Expurgatorius*, among the books that were prohibited, as hostile to the doctrines of the Church of Rome, in that year. Soon afterwards it was [2] ascribed to Oecolampadius, and pronounced a pernicious book. The next endeavour to invalidate its authenticity, was by imputing it to

in 1554, says " that he had read the work." Foxe. I think he would have also said, that he had translated it, if such had been the case.

[1] " One Bertram, *if the book set forth in his name be his.*" Gardiner, see Cranmer's Answer to him, edit. 1580, p. 6.

[2] By Sixtus Senensis in the Pref. to his Bibliotheca.

[1] John Scotus Erigena, who by some has been charged with fathering his own work upon his contemporary Bertram; while others have pretended, that [2] Berengarius and his followers might be the inventors of such an imposture. The celebrated Mabillon, in the seventeenth century, had seen a manuscript of it, at that time eight hundred years old; and allowed it to be the genuine work of Bertram. [3] Other Romanists have agreed with him. All the objections and pretences of the Roman Catholic writers against this early opponent to transubstantiation, have been

[1] Scotus was directed, as well as Bertram, by the emperor Charles, to answer Radbert, as he distinctly did, with a precision superior to that of his contemporary, but with him declaring plainly, that the bread and wine are only the signs and symbols of the absent body and blood of Christ. See Mosheim, cent. ix. § 20.

[2] Or Berenger, a French divine, of the eleventh century, "who left behind him in the minds of the people a deep impression of his extraordinary sanctity; and his followers were as numerous, as his fame was illustrious. There have been disputes among the learned, about the real sentiments of this eminent man; yet, notwithstanding the art which he sometimes uses to conceal his opinions, and the ambiguity that is often remarkable in his expressions, whoever examines with impartiality and attention such of his writings as are yet extant, will immediately perceive, that he looked upon the bread and wine in the sacrament as no more than the signs or symbols of the body and blood of the Divine Saviour." Mosheim.

[3] The Abbè Boileau published two editions of it at Paris, in 1699 and 1712.

acutely and learnedly refuted in the London edition of the *Catalogus Testium Veritatis,* in 1686, and in the dissertation prefixed to a new version of Bertram's treatise, published at Dublin in 1753.

Other translations, procured by means of Cranmer, had now been of signal service in forwarding the Reformation. Such were two against the Mass, of which one had appeared in French, the other in Latin. But more especially such was the "simple and religious Consultation of Herman, archbishop of Cologne, and prince elector, by what means a Christian Reformation, and founded on God's Word, of doctrine, administration of the divine sacraments, of ceremonies, of the whole cure of souls, and other ecclesiastical ministries, may be begun among men committed to our charge, until the Lord grant a better to be appointed either by a free and Christian council, general or national, or else by the states of the empire of the nation of Germany gathered together in the Holy Ghost." Like the book of English Homilies, it was divided into separate discourses, [1] more numerous, however, than those in our own formulary; and is [2] said to have been compiled by Melancthon and Bucer, not without the revision of the elector himself, about the year

[1] They are in number 57. Strype has printed the titles of them. Ecc. Mem. ii. 27.

[2] Strype, ibid.

1543. This attempt to introduce the Reformation into the diocese of Cologne, had been opposed by the canons of Herman's own cathedral, who were supported in their resistance by the emperor Charles. [1] Prohibited by that sovereign to proceed in the good work he meditated, and at length excommunicated by the pope, this excellent prelate retired from his archbishopric to a private life, and died in 1552. To the Reforming party in our own country his book was so acceptable, as to pass through [2] two editions in the first and second years of the reign of Edward; and both are now numbered among our volumes of rare occurrence.

While religious information was thus circulated, and the spirit of inquiry encouraged, general literature at this time here sustained irreparable damage in the plunder, dispersion, or entire destruction of many libraries, To Edward a remonstrance was now made by Bale, a very zealous Reformer, (afterwards bishop of Ossory,) upon this lamentable theme, not without referring to the similar spoliation in the reign of Henry, when the monasteries were suppressed. "[3] O that men of

[1] Robertson, Charles V.

[2] Strype is mistaken in supposing the first edition to be without the name of the printer, Ecc. Mem. ii. 26. "Imprinted by John Daye, &c." is announced in it.

[3] Dedication of Leland's Journey, &c. to Edward, 1549 or 1550.

learning and of perfect love to their nation," he thus addresses the young king, "had been *then* appointed to the search of their libraries for the conservation of those most noble antiquities. Covetousness was at that time so busy about private commodity, that public wealth in that most necessary and godly respect was not any where regarded. If your most noble father, of excellent memory, king Henry, had not of a godly zeal, by special commission, directed Master John Leland to oversee a number of their said libraries, we had lost infinite treasure of knowledge, by the spoil which anon after followed of their due suppression."

The employment of the accomplished scholar Leland had commenced before the dissolution of religious houses. When Cranmer was appointed archbishop, Leland was nominated, by a commission under the broad seal, the king's antiquary; [1] the first, and indeed the last, that bore this honourable office. By the commission he was appointed to search after England's antiquities, and to peruse the libraries of all cathedrals, abbies, priories, and colleges, as also all places wherein records, writings, and secrets of antiquity were reposited. Promoted as he had been by the king, to the rectory of Poppeling, in the marches of Calais, which were a [2] part of Cranmer's diocese, his acquaint-

[1] Life of Leland, Oxf. 1772, p. 9.

[2] See before, vol. i. p. 174.

ance with the primate, we may suppose, was soon formed. Returned from his laborious employment, he spent several years in London, methodizing his collections, and also presenting to his sovereign many finished proofs of his zeal and discernment. Soon after the death of Henry, he fell into a deep melancholy. [1] At this time, his great concern for the preservation of his papers he expressed in a copy of Latin verses to Cranmer, whose patronage the [2] accustomed candour and kindness of the archbishop (as he words it) naturally led him to expect. He soon after was totally deprived of his senses; and by the Council of Edward, in March 1550, was consigned, with ample provision for his maintenance, to the custody of his brother. He died in 1552.

It was about the time, when Bale addressed Edward on the subject of the libraries, that the young king had consented to the Council's desire of having his own at Westminster examined, in order (it was said) to dismiss from it all missals, legends, and other superstitious books, recited in the [3] Act that had lately passed. Of such

[1] Life, ut supr. p. 22.

[2] CRANMERE, *eximium decus piorum,*
Implorare *tuam benignitatem*
Cogor: fac igitur *tuo sueto*
Pro *candore,* meum decus, patronumque,
Ut tantum faveat &c. Strype.

[3] See before, p. 167.

many were curiously embossed with gold and silver; and these attractive appendages were directed to be [1] delivered to Sir Anthony Aucher, as the plate and jewels of churches [2] before had been. The endeavours of Cranmer to stop the pillage even of [3] brass and lead, as well as gold and silver, belonging to churches and chapels, had been ineffectual. Himself and Ridley had both [4] incurred the displeasure of Northumberland, for opposing "[5] the spoil of church goods, taken away only by the command of the higher powers, without any law or order of justice, and without any request or consent of them to whom they belong." The Reformation, however, has been too hastily vilified, as if it had encouraged a general destruction of literary treasures; as if Cranmer and Ridley, distinguished as they were for their literary acquirements, and their zeal to disseminate knowledge, had not exerted themselves for the interests of science and literature. On the contrary, from the monastic and other libraries of their time have descended to our pre-

[1] The letter is dated Feb. 25, 1550. Collier, ii. 307.

[2] See Proceedings of the Privy Council, Jan. 1547. From the Archæologia, 1815, p. 11.

[3] See before, p. 41. Churches were stripped of their lead, and monuments of their brasses.

[4] Bishop Ridley's Treatise lamenting the state of England. Foxe.

[5] Ibid.

sent possession numerous ancient manuscripts of the utmost importance in the history and the application of sound learning. Over the loss of legends, missals, and breviaries, as well as the intricate works of the schoolmen, often, indeed, we meet with lamentation. "[1] Many manuscripts," says Wood, deploring the havoc at Oxford, in 1550, "guilty of no other superstition than red letters in their fronts or titles, were either condemned to the fire or the jakes. The works of the schoolmen, namely of P. Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus and his followers, with critics also, and such as had popish scholia in them, they cast out of[2] all college libraries and private studies. Not content with this, they slandered those most noble authors, as guilty of barbarism, ignorance of the Scriptures, and much deceit; and as much as in them lay, endeavoured to damn their memories to all eternity. And lest their impiety and foolishness in this act should be further wanting, they brought it so to pass, that certain rude young men should carry this great spoil of books about the city on biers; which being done, to set them down in the common market-place, and there burn them; to the sorrow of many, as well of the Protestant as of the other party. This was by

[1] Annals, Univ. Oxon. under the year 1550.

[2] And yet in College and Cathedral libraries innumerable manuscripts of the schoolmen remain to this day!

them styled *the funeral* [1] *of Scotus and Scotists.* So that at this time, and in all this king's reign, was seldom seen any thing in the University but books of Poetry, Grammar, idle songs, and frivolous stuff."

Such was the reflection, more than a century since, made by the Oxford antiquary upon the great object of the Reformation, freedom of thought and investigation of general subjects. He might have said, if his taste had been equal to his learning, that in the reign of Edward there was at least a little good poetry, that there was some valuable philology, and some useful translations of classical and philosophical works, by men who owed their education to Oxford. The revival of literature, indeed, while it was now strenuously encouraged by [2] Cranmer, was also advocated with his accustomed quaintness by Latimer, who in a sermon, preached before the king in 1550, said, " Here now should I speak of Universities,

[1] Scotus had met with no better usage in the preceding reign. " When in 1535 the king's visitors ordered lectures in humanity to be founded in those societies at Oxford, where they were yet wanting, the injunctions were so warmly seconded and approved by the scholars in the largest colleges, that they seized on the venerable volumes of Duns Scotus, and other irrefragable logicians, and tearing them in pieces, dispersed them in great triumph about their quadrangles, or gave them away as useless lumber." Warton's Life of Sir T. Pope, p. 148.

[2] See before, p. 36.

and for preferring of schools: but he that preached the last Sunday, spake very well in it, and substantially, and like one that knew the state and condition of the Universities and schools very well. But thus much I say unto you, magistrates; *If ye will not maintain schools and Universities, ye shall have a brutality :"* — in other words, neither spiritual nor intellectual liberty shall be your's.

CHAPTER VIII.

1549 to 1551.

Learned foreigners in England—Peter Martyr—Bernardine Ochin—Martin Bucer—Paul Fagius—and others—Their appointments—Their opinions—Bucer notices the revenues of the English Church—Cranmer's letter concerning impropriations—John à Lasco's recommendation to Cranmer of more foreigners after the death of Bucer.

In the palace of Lambeth had now been assembled several learned foreigners, of whom some had been invited thither by the archbishop, some had been in pity received as persecuted Protestants, and all were by him generously entertained. Of these guests the earliest appear to have been the celebrated Peter Martyr and Bernardine Ochin, both Italians, highly distinguished at Naples, where the former, with the dignity of an abbot, had been also provost of a college, and the latter the chief director of the friars denominated capuchins. The religious sentiments of both, in favour of the reformed religion, had been expressed with great effect; and "[1] by the blessing of God on the labours of these individuals, a Re-

[1] M'Crie's History of the Reformation in Italy, &c. 120.

formed Church was established at Naples, which included persons of the first rank, both male and female." Martyr afterwards was distinguished by his zeal at Lucca, as Ochin was by his preaching at Venice. Of the former, it has been said, that he "[1] excelled as much in judgment and learning, as the latter did in popular eloquence." But soon their efforts were opposed, the papal influence threatened their labours and even their lives, they fled from their native country, took shelter first in Switzerland, and then at Strasburg, [2] where the letters of invitation from Cranmer found them.

An [3] account of expences attending their journey to England has been preserved, which, while it shews their arrival to have been [4] rather later than our historians represent it, affords much curious information both on the manners of the time, and in regard to provisions for the learned travellers. The charges of their guide commence at Basle, on the 4th of November, continuing "until the 20th of December, that they came to London;" and amount to one hundred and twenty six pounds, of which a very large proportion is

[1] M'Crie's History of the Reformation in Italy, &c. 119.

[2] Burnet, A. Wood, Ann. Univ. Ox. under 1548.

[3] Printed in the Archæologia, vol. xxi. 469, seq. communicated by a very acute and diligent antiquary, N. H. Nicolas, Esq.

[4] Burnet and others name their arrival in November, 1547: it appears to have been at the latter end of December.

for books, especially for Ochin, the bill for which was delivered to Cranmer, who had probably given directions for these accompaniments; while those for Peter Martyr, were only "the works of St. Augustine, Cyprian, and Epiphanius." The visit of these eminent divines is [1] supposed to have been approved, and the charges of their journey to have been defrayed, by the government.

For Ochin, who was to exercise his eloquent preaching in London, Cranmer almost immediately obtained from the Crown a prebend of Canterbury; and for Martyr, whose knowledge of Hebrew and Greek was to stand the test of academical approbation, the professorship of divinity at Oxford. The appointment of the latter was greatly resented by the party, who maintained in that University the doctrine of transubstantiation; whose belief in it the new professor, therefore, endeavoured to shake by his primary [2] lectures upon that part of the eleventh chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, which refers to the Lord's Supper. Sanders, the Romish historian, pretends, that Martyr now [3] hesitated between the doctrine of Luther and that of Zuinglius, between consubstantiation and a denial of the corporal presence, as if he waited for instruc-

[1] Archæol. ut supr. 470.

[2] Strype.

[3] This is not said by Sanders in his first edition of 1585; but in the second of 1586 the fabrication occurs, p. 274.

tions from the archbishop and the government which to advocate. But Martyr, [1] before his arrival in England, had abandoned the tenet of the corporal presence; and before that arrival, Cranmer, with whom we may be sure the Protector concurred, had also abandoned it. Heylin relates, not accurately, upon the authority of Sanders, [2] that the professor at this time declared himself so much a Zuinglian, as to have given great offence to Cranmer and other prelates; and yet Cranmer and Ridley at least, if not others of their mitred brethren, had now espoused the doctrine of Zuinglius. But the professor is defended upon this very point by the archbishop himself. "[3] Of M. Peter Martyr's opinion and judgment in this matter," Cranmer says, "no man can better testify than I; forasmuch, as he lodged within my house long before he came to Oxford, and I had with him many conferences in that matter, and know, that he was *then of the same mind that he is now, and as he defended after openly in Oxford,* and hath written in his book." By the Romanists at Oxford, he was challenged to a public disputation. He accepted it, with the approbation of the Privy Council, by whom, in 1549, delegates of rank and learning were appointed to attend it; and he maintained, 1. That in

[1] Strype, Ecc. Mem. ii. 122.

[2] Hist. Ref. 79.

[3] Answer to Dr. Smith's Pref. 402.

the sacrament of the Eucharist [1] there is no transubstantiation of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. 2. That the body and blood of Christ are not corporally or carnally in or under the species of bread and wine. 3. That the body and blood of Christ are united to the bread and wine [2] sacramentally. Four days the disputation continued, the professor contending against three opponents, the doctors Tresham and Chedsey, and Mr. Morgan Philips, usually [3] called Morgan the sophister. Dr. Cox, dean of Christchurch, as moderator, at the close of the business, addressed the several disputants, not without a compliment to the skill of each, but with one more especially gratifying to Martyr "[4] for the numberless testimonies produced by him in behalf of the truth. *Such as he is, he must obtain favour and respect from us, and from all good men;* first, because he has taken such pains in sustaining even a burden of disputations; for if not Hercules himself could withstand two, what shall we think of Martyr against all? secondly, because he accepted the challenge, and thus stopped the mouths

[1] Burnet, Strype, A. Wood, Ann. Univ. Ox. under the year 1548.

[2] That is, as he wrote to Bucer, "he meant it in mind and faith."

[3] A. Wood, ut supr.

[4] Strype gives a larger extract from Dr. Cox's oration. Life of Cranm. B. ii. ch. 14.

of vain men, who dispersed envious and odious accusations against him, as one who was either afraid or unwilling to maintain his own cause; and lastly, that he has so fully answered the expectation of the chief magistrates, and so of the king himself; while *he has not only recommended to the University the doctrine of Christ from the living fountains of the Word of God, but has not permitted others to obscure or obstruct them.*" By Dr. Chedsey, and the Romish party, Martyr was traduced, as if he had been vanquished. To confute their slanders, he afterwards [1] published the whole disputation, and his fidelity was attested by the subscription to it of the royal delegates who presided at the disputation. Meantime he sent to Cranmer by "Julius, his constant [2] companion and friend," as Strype calls him, an account of the disputation, and to Bucer, who was then at Lambeth Palace, an explanation of such passages in it, as he thought might not accord with that Reformer's judgment, whose sentiments on the corporal presence seemed not so far removed from the Church of Rome, at that time, as his own.

Bucer had been invited by the archbishop to

[1] Simler, Vita P. Martyris.

[2] In the Archæologia this person is mistakenly called Martyr's servant. He was an Italian, named Julio Terentiano, and accompanied Martyr hither. Martyr speaks of him as a friend in his letters, Gerdesii Miscell. iv. 666, 667.

England in October 1548, and again in the March following. He came accompanied with Paul Fagius, another German, both eminently qualified to propagate the doctrines of the Reformation. In the eastern languages Fagius was profoundly skilled, as Bucer was in the Greek. To instruct the students at Cambridge they were therefore designed; Fagius being directed to expound the Old Testament, Bucer the New. To the latter was granted the same honourable distinction in the University as at Oxford Martyr enjoyed; his appointment to which by the king, at the recommendation of Cranmer, was thus announced to the vice-chancellor and proctors of the University.

"[1] Trusty and well-beloved, We greet you well; letting you to wit, that forasmuch as We be credibly informed of your good conformity to all such order as We, by our late visitors, directed unto you, and of your industry and diligent study which you daily take to attain to all kinds of good learning; and specially hearing of your good zeal and affection to God's most holy Word, not only to understand the tongues wherein the same was written, whereby you may come to the true and sincere sense and meaning of the same, but also in your livings to conform yourselves thereunto, and as it were to transform yourselves into

[1] Cole's MSS. Brit. Mus. vol. 42, p. 425.

the manner and shape of God's Word, that you may be lights to shine to our whole realm; We cannot but much rejoice to have this good report of you, knowing that our two Universities being the wells and fountains of religion within our realm, whatsoever pure godliness is among you, the same must needs flow into the rest of our realms; and to the intent, that your godly endeavours and studies may have the more success, and for the love that we bear to this our University, We having at this present within our realm Martin Bucer, a man of profound learning, and of godly life and conversation, have thought good, by the advice of our trusty and well-beloved councillors, to bestow him upon you to read the Lecture of Holy Scripture, which Dr. Madewe lately read, to the great comfort and condition of all such as be godly and quietly bent to the pure understanding of Holy Scripture. Wherefore, We pray you and require you, and nevertheless command you, so to entertain and use him with all gentleness and humanity, that he be at no time discouraged in his godly doings, but rather comforted and encouraged to persevere in the same, as ye tender our pleasure and your own commodity. Given at our palace at Westminster, the iiij. of December, in the third year of our reign."

To the professorship of the Hebrew tongue, Fagius was, at the same time, appointed. For him,

as for Bucer, Cranmer procured from the king, in addition to the academical advantages of their offices, the honorary [1] annual stipend of one hundred pounds. To Ochin, and to Martyr, and to other learned foreigners, the royal munificence, through the same interposition, was also extended. "[2] I heard say, Master Melancthon, that great clerk, should come hither," honest Latimer observed in a sermon before Edward; "I would wish him, and such as he is, to have two hundred pounds a year; the king should never want it in his coffers at the year's end. There are yet among us two great learned men, Peter Martyr and Bernard Ochin, which have a hundred marks a-piece: I would the king would bestow a thousand pounds on that sort." Melancthon, however, never visited England.

The subject of the lectures, to be delivered by Fagius and Bucer, which Cranmer himself dictated, was with a view to the production of as pure and genuine a translation of the Scriptures as was possible. They were by him [3] required to give a clear and succinct interpretation of the sacred text, according to the propriety of the language; to explain difficult and obscure passages; and to reconcile those that seemed to differ from each other. Fagius had begun to illustrate the

[1] Strype.

[2] Sermon before the king, March 22 1549.

[3] Strype.

prophecies of Isaiah, and Bucer the Gospel of St. John, while yet resident in Lambeth Palace, when sickness attacked them both. The former, still anxiously desired to [1] commence his lectures in the University, which he reached only [2] there to die. Ere fifteen months had rolled away, the latter also at the same place [3] breathed his last. Of the skill of Fagius in Hebrew and rabbinical learning the world had received [4] abundant proofs; although in England disease suppressed the intended exercise of his great abilities. The little time that was left to Bucer was so employed, as to obtain at Cambridge all the attention he could desire, and the [5] highest honour she could bestow.

Upon the Eucharistic question, Cranmer, we have [6] seen, declared what he knew to be the judgment of Peter Martyr. An opinion of Bucer he has also given us. Gardiner had misrepresented that Reformer. Cranmer thus replied to him: "[7] Bucer varieth much from your error;

[1] Strype. Some modern writers assert, incorrectly, that he had begun his lectures at Cambridge.

[2] In November, 1549. Not in 1550, as stated in Scott's History of the Church of Christ, ii. 135.

[3] In February, 1551.

[4] Strype gives a list of his numerous publications. Life of Cranm. Append. No. 44.

[5] The degree of doctor in divinity was given to him, as a peculiar honour, without the usual forms in those cases, except that he chose to perform the literary exercises for it. Strype.

[6] See before, p. 191.

[7] Answer to Gardiner, ed. 1580. p. 266.

for he denieth utterly that Christ is really and substantially present in the bread, either by conversion or inclusion, but in the ministration he affirmeth Christ to be present, and so do I also, but [1] not to be eaten and drunken of them that be wicked and members of the devil, whom Christ neither feedeth, nor hath any communion with them. And, to conclude in few words the doctrine of M. Bucer in the place by you alleged, he dissenteth in no thing from Oecolampadius and Zuinglius." To Cranmer, therefore, Bucer appears to have expressed himself, on this grand tenet, without reserve. To others he spoke or wrote with less simplicity, but with a view to conciliate, in the sacramental controversy, as his [2] manner was in other religious disputes, the opposers and maintainers of it. Melancthon alluded to this

[1] If Christ's body is corporally present in the sacrament, then all persons, good or bad, who receive the sacrament, do also receive Christ. On the other hand, if Christ is present only in a spiritual manner, and if the mean that receives Christ is faith, then such as believe not do not receive him. So that *to prove that the wicked do not receive Christ's body and blood, is upon the matter the same thing with proving that he is not corporally present.* And it is a very considerable branch of our argument, by which we prove that the Fathers did not believe the corporal presence, because they very often say, that the wicked do not receive Christ in the sacrament. Burnet on the 29th Article.

[2] Bucer, like Erasmus, endeavoured to pacify religious disputants, and bring things to an accommodation; and, like Erasmus, he was insulted by both parties. Jortin, Erasm. i. 430.

kind of concession without adopting it; for it was his constant maxim, that "[1] ambiguous terms only generate new controversies;" and a friend of Melancthon, to whom the Reformed Church of Italy was much indebted, Celio Secundo Curio, in his [2] humorous strictures upon the errors of the Church of Rome, notices the concession of Bucer, in order to deny so seeming a dereliction of the Protestant cause.

The impoverished revenues of the English Church escaped not the observation of Bucer. From Cambridge he wrote to Calvin on this important topic. Calvin sent a letter, in consequence, to the archbishop: [3] *the rents of the Church,* said he, *being exposed to be a prey,* fit persons might not perhaps be found, at least would not be encouraged, to perform the ministerial duties. The archbishop now seems to have planned a design of recovering,

[1] Strype.

[2] Pasquillus Ecstaticus, 12mo. without date or place of printing. Oporinus, however, is believed to have printed it at Basle. "Ita Bucerus *sermonem temperavit, verbaque ponderavit,* ut nemo quid sibi in ea re (cœna Domini) velit intelligere possit, &c." p. 150. This little volume of Curio is of extreme rarity, and is one of the various very powerful and satirical works against the pope, monks, &c. which at the beginning of the Reformation in Italy were by him, by Hutten, and others, circulated, and which, from the circumstance of their being burnt wherever they were seized by the papal orders, became scarce.

[3] Quòd prædæ expositi sunt Ecclesiæ reditus. Calvini Ep. 127. Strype.

from the hands of laymen, the inpropriations which had been granted to them at the dissolution of the monasteries; and to assign the lands and tithes of benefices, as they were originally intended, to the maintenance of incumbents. The following letter, addressed to the bishop of Exeter, was probably sent to all the prelates; but the impropriations have remained to the present time.

" [1] After my hearty commendations, the king's Majesty's pleasure and high commandment to me is, that I shall will and charge you to ascertain me the names of all such benefices within your diocese, as at any time have been or yet be impropried, in whose hands and possession the same have been, either in his Majesty's, or any his Grace's subjects; with your true certificate also of all vicarages endowed within your said diocese, and of all other churches impropried having no vicarages endowed, being either served by a manual priest, or destitute of a curate; with the several values of such vicarages and benefices, as nigh as you may. Fail you not this to do with all celerity, as you tender the accomplishment of his Grace's pleasure. Fare you well. From my Manor of Lambeth, this xx. of April, 1550.

" Your loving brother,

" T. CANTUAR."

[1] Wilkins, Concil. iv. 62.

Bucer and Fagius had been accompanied to England by Matthew Regelius, afterwards a minister at Strasburg, who was also received under Cranmer's hospitable roof, now open, indeed, to the Reformers of various countries.

There, from Artois, was Peter Alexander, whom the archbishop employed as his secretary; who had been [1] inclined to the Lutheran tenet of consubstantiation, but had relinquished it, as Martyr informed Calvin, to whom, having subscribed to an agreement upon this point with Zuinglius, the notice would give pleasure. Like Bucer and Fagius, this learned secretary appears to have written at Lambeth expositions of Scripture.

There had now been also, in the palace, Justus Jonas the younger, and his three companions, from Germany, whose arrival has [2] already been noticed. The recommendation of Melancthon had introduced them. Young as Justus Jonas was, Strype calls him a "great divine." Cranmer appears to have placed entire confidence in him, and to have consulted him on important points. He imparted to him, first, his wish for the union of all Protestant Churches, and then desired him to communicate it to Melancthon, with a request for his judgment upon it, which presently will be before us. Eusebius Menius, another of these visitors, was the son of Justus

[1] Strype. [2] See the present vol. p. 43.

Menius, an eminent preacher at Saxe-Gotha. He was described as worthy the notice of the archbishop, not only as the son of one who had deserved well of the Reformed Church, but as a man of distinguished learning, especially in that branch of it, which might render him [1] acceptable to the University of Cambridge, mathematics. He had good preferment in Germany, Melancthon further said of him, but he could not endure to behold the calamities of his country, and therefore sought in a foreign land a maintenance. The next of these foreigners was Francis Dryander, whose real name was Enzinas, a Spaniard of noble birth, who had visited Germany, and been long acquainted with Melancthon. Of him the great Reformer reported to Cranmer, that he had found him endowed with excellent abilities, that his theological opinions, like his conduct, were correct, and that he was worthy to be preferred in either of our Universities. Strype supposes that he was sent to Oxford, and continued there till the reign of Mary; but by the great historian of that University his name is unnoticed. Peter Martyr, however, [2] appears to have invited him

[1] Strype.

[2] P. Martyris Epist. ad Utenhovium. "Veniat (Dryander) cum voluerit, experiri poterit; si fortuna placebit, utetur; sin minus, semper redire poterit, quocunque voluerit. Nec eum, ut arbitror, pœnitebit *hanc urbem et universitatem semel vidisse*. Oxonii, 9 Maii, 1549." Gerdesii Miscell. iv. 666.

thither. The third companion of Justus Jonas, was Rodolph Gualter, of Zurich, a relation of Zuinglius, and afterwards the successor of Bullinger in the pastorship of his native place.

A more distinguished guest, at this time, was John à Lasco, a nobleman of Poland, the nephew of an archbishop of that name. The present friend of Cranmer has been described by some, inaccurately, as having at first been a Roman Catholic prelate. To that communion, indeed, he belonged, when, more than twenty years before, he [1] lived and boarded with Erasmus, by whose conversation and writings he was led into the reformed systems, though Erasmus himself did not go so far. In his heart Erasmus certainly approved the Reformation, but dared not openly express himself a Reformer; a character, notwithstanding, which his works, however guarded, often confer upon him, and justify the zeal with which Cranmer [2] studied them, as they excited also the concurrence of Gardiner in the well-known [3] sarcasm, "Erasmus laid the eggs, and Luther hatched them." John à Lasco had now embraced the Reformation, had forsaken his country, and had become preacher to a Protestant congregation at Embden. His present visit was with a view to establish this congregation in London; which

[1] Jortin, i. 379, [2] See before, vol. i. p. 4. 10
[3] See the present vol, p. 16.

afterwards Cranmer was instrumental in effecting. The dissolved convent of the Augustine friars, and some political privileges, were granted them. Into our country were thus introduced many useful hands for arts and manufactures, which she lost when the ministry of the noble Pole was suppressed at the accession of Mary, and himself, with most of the foreign Protestants, left the kingdom. Eminent alike for piety and learning, he had been appointed superintendent over other congregations also of the reformed aliens in London, Italian and French. Possessed of sufficient means, he was ever ready to assist such of them as asked his aid. In the controversies of our own Church he interfered, injudiciously, as some have contended; and his [1] long address to Cranmer, in which he objects to the clerical habits, and kneeling at the reception of the sacrament, certainly bespeaks a violent but mistaken opinion of the subjects. To his foreign friends he repeatedly mentions his obligations to Cranmer. He was at Embden, when the news of Cranmer's conviction arrived, which he [2] communicated to a correspondent, accompanied with information attending it, not recorded by any of the archbishop's bio-

[1] See it in Gerdesii Miscell. tom. ii. 656-670.

[2] Cranmer was convicted of treason in November, 1553. The letter of à Lasco is dated in December. Gerdesii Miscell. ii. 695.

graphers; that, after his conviction, Cranmer was publicly led through London; that the grief of the spectators was general; that he was unshaken, and even cheerful; that he prayed there might be no tumults; and that eight days only were to elapse before he should suffer, which perhaps was at first the intention of Mary and her Council.

To the patronage of Cranmer, in great measure, may be also ascribed the establishment of another "[1] church of strangers," consisting chiefly of French and Walloons, at Glastonbury, in Somersetshire. Of these Valeran Pullan, who had been a preacher at Strasburg, was the superintendent; and Strype believes him to have been one of the foreign divines entertained in his house by the archbishop. Their petition, which was granted, was, [2] that they might be permitted to form themselves into a church for the free exercise of religion, and to follow peaceably their trade of weaving, which would be advantageous to the realm; in order to which, they asked for the tenements of some dissolved monastery, and the venerable abbey of Glastonbury was thus converted into a manufactory. At Canterbury, Norwich, and other places in the kingdom, French and Walloon congregations were soon afterwards formed. These refugees were commanded to leave the realm at the accession of Mary. Most

[1] Strype. [2] Ibid.

of them repaired to Frankfort, whither the exiles from our own country in that persecuting reign soon afterwards fled, and there experienced a return of the kindness and liberality that had been shewn in England, by being allowed to preach their own doctrines, and to practise their own discipline.

There was another learned divine who was welcomed at Lambeth, of whom no notice has been taken by Burnet, Strype, or any English writer who has treated of the Reformation; Simon Alexius, a [1] Frenchman. Gerdes of Groningen, whose abundant collections so powerfully illustrate the history of the Reformation, both in our own and other countries, has [2] given an account of a work left by him in manuscript, which he had written at the [3] command of Cranmer, while living under his roof, in defence of the true doctrine of the sacrament, and in refutation of the Romish mass. It consists of seven dialogues, to

[1] The editor of Simon Alexius's work, who was a Frenchman, calls him "vir, cui propter insignem ministerii Verbi Dei functionem, atque ob amicitiam et *communis* quoque *patriæ memoriam*, plurimùm tribuendum existimo." Præf.

[2] In his Florilegium Hist. Crit. Libb. Rar. cui multa adsperguntur historiam Reformationis ecclesiasticam illustrantia, &c. Ed. 1763, p. 13.

[3] "Hos (dialogos) non edendi causa olim Londini scripserat, sed *ut illustrissimi viri et Christo fidelissimi martyris, Thomæ Cranmeri, apud quem tum agebat, mandato satisfaceret.*" Præf.

which the editor, Crispin of Arras, a printer at Geneva, affixed a title, and published them there after the death of the author, in [1] 1557. The title contains a [2] reflection on the revival in England of the mass in the reign of Mary, and the preface relates how greatly the subject of the work had interested Cranmer, and how fit he thought Alexius to discuss it. The dialogues display much spirit as well as sound argument.

Emanuel Tremellio, of Italy, [3] now also partook of the archiepiscopal hospitality, and has left a grateful character of it, in which he [4] alludes to Cranmer's general acquaintance with languages. The travels as well as the studies of the archbishop had rendered the German, Italian, and French, as familiar to him as the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. Tremellio was the son of a Jew, born at Ferrara,

[1] Such is the date, in manuscript, affixed to a copy of the work, which I have inspected in the public library at Cambridge. Gerdes describes it as printed a year later.

[2] It is thus: "De origine novi dei missatici, *quondam in Anglia mortui, nunc denuò ab inferis excitati*, Dialogi VII. In quibus purissimi Sacræ Scripturæ fontes, ad impurissimas scholasticæ doctrinæ lacunas collati, non tantùm verum Cœnæ Dominicæ usum ostendunt, sed etiam impium missæ papisticæ abusum patefaciunt. Simone Alexio authore. Genevæ."

[3] Strype, Ecc. Mem. ii. 206.

[4] "Archiepiscopi domus *publicum erat doctis et piis omnibus hospitium;* quod ipse hospes, Mecænas et pater, talibus semper patere voluit, quoad vixit, aut potuit; homo φιλοξενος, nec minus φιλολογος."

and eminent not only as an oriental but as a general scholar. At first a convert to Christianity in the palace of cardinal Pole, at Viterbo, he afterwards embraced the opinions of the Reformers, and became an assistant to Peter Martyr, at Lucca, in promoting the study of sacred literature, giving instructions in Hebrew. To England he followed his great countryman, and at length was appointed, through the recommendation of Cranmer, to supply the loss at Cambridge of the Hebrew professor Fagius. In his lectures there, another stranger, Ralph Cavalier, a Frenchman, was his coadjutor, and for his services was rewarded with a prebend in Cranmer's cathedral, as Tremellio himself was with the same distinction in the church of Carlisle. The labours of this learned Italian appear to have obtained the hearty [1] approbation of the University. To biblical scholars his Latin translation of the Scriptures is familiar, but his valuable Hebrew catechism is little known.

Martyr, and Ochin, and Tremellio would probably often converse with Cranmer upon the spread of the reformed opinions in their own country, and upon the measures adopted to suppress them. The two former would not fail to mention with gratitude him who had [2] encouraged their labours at Naples, and in many parti-

[1] See the Letter respecting him from Bishop Goodrich. Strype, Ecc. Mem. ii. 387.

[2] M'Crie.

culars embraced their tenets, the celebrated Marc Antonio Flaminio, whose amiable character must have been well known to Cranmer; and the circumstance of whose residence with cardinal [1] Pole in the latter part of his life, till he died in 1550, would excite additional attention to the remembrance of him. For it might now be rumoured in England, (as it had been abroad,) by the Roman Catholics, that the cardinal had brought him to an acknowledgement of his pretended heresy, although his writings prove him a sound adherent to almost every Protestant position. To the poetical studies also of Flaminio, for his [2] name was no less dear to the Muses than to virtue, Cranmer and his guests might advert; to his metrical paraphrases of the Psalms, or to his other elegant poems. Nor would the Italian Reformers now forget another poet of their country, as he had sharply lashed the corruptions of the Church of Rome, the sublime, but extravagant Dante; and to [3] Chaucer, the venerable bard of England, who soon after Dante spared not those corruptions, Cranmer might thence be led to refer, and to tell that while the bard studied at Oxford, he was [4] said

[1] Cardinal Caraffa complained of Pole's countenancing Flaminio.

[2] See Fifty of his select poems, excellently translated by the late Rev. E. W. Barnard, M.A. of Trin. Coll. Camb. 1829, and the Memoir prefixed, p. v.

[3] See what is said of Chaucer and Cranmer, vol. i. p. 329.

[4] A. Wood.

to be a pupil of Wicliffe. Wicliffe they would acknowledge as the father of the Reformation, being the first in Europe who had rendered accessible to all his countrymen, by a translation of them into the vulgar tongue, the Old and New Testaments. Nor might his memory as a translator of the Scriptures alone command their attention. His opinion respecting the Eucharist might not be overpassed. To him Cranmer might now point as the supporter of his own belief, that in that sacrament the body and blood of Christ are not essentially, nor substantially, nor bodily, but [1] figuratively; a statement, by which I venture to correct the recent assertion of a learned historian, that "[2] Wicliffe's opinion respecting the Lord's Supper, is supposed to have nearly resembled that peculiar to Luther and his followers." On the contrary, it was that adopted by Zuinglius, and by Oecolampadius, to both of whom, in the sacramental doctrine, Luther and his followers were vehemently opposed. Gardiner, in his controversy with Cranmer, thus arranged the opponents to the doctrine of the corporal presence: "[3] First was Bertram, then Berengarius, then Wicliffe;

[1] The accusers of Wicliffe at Oxford, thus stated his opinion, "Quòd Eucharistia in altari post consecrationem non est verum corpus Christi, sed ejus figura." Wood, Ann. Ox. under the year 1377.

[2] Sir James Mackintosh's Hist. Eng. under the year 1382.

[3] Gardiner's Explication, &c. 1551, fol. 74. b.

and in our time Oecolampadius, Zuinglius, and Joachim Vadianus."

With Ochin also, as with Dryander, the discourse of Cranmer might now have often turned on the great point of justification by faith in Christ; that being the favourite subject of the former, and to the latter had been the cause of an extended imprisonment: and to both the archbishop might urge, what our homilies and liturgy abundantly teach, the necessity of something more, in order to justification, "[1] than a bare persuasion of faith." Dryander had published, in 1543, a [2] Spanish version of the New Testament, which he dedicated to the emperor Charles, but which saved him not from being cast into prison by the Inquisition; and the printer of it at Antwerp [3] having distinguished the twenty-eighth verse of the third chapter of the Epistle to the Romans in capital letters, "man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law," the distinction, though not directed by the translator, afforded pretence to his enemies for a longer bereavement of his liberty.

Martyr having arrived in England at the time when our liturgy was first in preparation, and

[1] Abp. Laurence, Bampton Lect. 134.

[2] Of this translation, which is extremely rare, some account is given, together with the dedication of it, in the Bibliotheca Española, Madrid, 1781, p. 449-453.

[3] Gerdes, Hist. Ref. et Florileg. ut supr. 110.

Bucer when it was first published, Latin versions of it were submitted to their judgment. Always at Lambeth, when not engaged in their professorial duties at Oxford and Cambridge, they would then confer with Cranmer upon subjects connected with the formulary, and upon the revision of it that was meditated. The successful attacks of the former, as of Ochin also, in their own country, upon the tenet of purgatory, Cranmer too would notice, not without hearty congratulation. Against this fundamental doctrine of popery himself had argued before his sovereign, [1] soon after his advancement to the primacy. The notions of Ochin, however, respecting predestination, were not those of the archbishop, who yet hindered not the publication of them, consonant although they were with those of Calvin, in [2] our own language. The best way to arrive at truth, Cranmer considered to be in hearing what men of acknowledged piety and learning might advance upon doctrines now generally taught, although strange inferences were drawn from them. The character of Ochin was

[1] See vol. i. p. 117.

[2] "Sermons of Bernardine Ochyne, concerning the predestination and election of God, &c. Translated out of Italian into our native tongue, by A. C." This A. C. was Anne Cook, one of the learned daughters of Sir Anthony Cook, married after to sir Nicholas Bacon, lord-keeper of the great seal. The translation is dedicated to her mother. Day is the printer of it, in 1548, it is supposed.

then unexceptionable, and so continued while he was in England: long afterwards he appeared, in his dialogues, an advocate of polygamy as well as an anti-trinitarian, and closed his days with the loss of that esteem, which his former labours had won. Not such was the end of his fellow-traveller to this country, the modest, and the eminently learned, Peter Martyr, who spent his last years, beloved and respected, at Zurich; and left behind him a name of exalted and unblemished character, both in the annals of the Reformed Church, and of literature. Gardiner, indeed, who had listened to his brethren of the Romish party at Oxford, affected to question his learning, because of his disputation there on the sacrament. Cranmer thus vindicated him. "[1] Concerning him that told you," he replied to Gardiner, "that Peter Martyr was not learned, I would wish you to leave (this old rooted fault in you) to be light of credit. For I suppose, that if *his* learning that told you that lie, and *your's* also, were set [2] both together, you should be far behind M. Peter Martyr. Marry, in words I think that you alone would overlay two Peter Martyrs, he

[1] Answer to Gardiner, ed. 1580, p. 232.

[2] Not unlike the reply, in our own times, of the celebrated musician Mozart, to one who meant to compliment his compositions at the expence of his great professional contemporary, Haydn: "If you and I, Sir, were melted down together, we should not furnish materials for one Haydn."

is so sober a man, and delighteth not in wasting words in vain. And none do say, that he is not learned, but such as know him not, or be not learned themselves, or else be so malicious or envious, that they wittingly speak against their own conscience. And, no doubt, that man bringeth himself out of the estimation of a learned man, who hath heard him reason and read, and saith that he is not learned. And, whosoever mis-reporteth him, and hath never heard him, may not be called so well Momus, as Sycophanta, whose property is to misreport them whom they neither see nor know."

It has been [1] generally stated, that, when Bucer died, Melancthon was immediately intended by Cranmer for the chair of divinity at Cambridge. Certainly Melancthon was then, as he had been before, invited hither. But the archbishop also appears to have consulted, at this time, with John à Lasco, upon introducing into England other continental divines of the Reformed Church; and that the noble Pole accordingly [2] recommended men who have been highly celebrated for their

[1] By Strype, Ecc. Mem. ii. 244. By archbishop Laurence, Bampton Lect. 188.

[2] "Quo mortuo, (M. Bucero,) communicavit mecum D. Cantuariensis consilium de advocandis huc aliquot viris doctis. Proposui itaque Musculum, Bibliandrum vestrum, et Castalionem." Epist. à Lasco ad Bullingerum, Londini, x. Apr. 1551. Gerdesii Miscell. iv. 470.

illustrious talents; Sebastian Castalio, whose extensive learning and elegant taste, whose opposition also to the predestinarian dogma of Calvin, as well as his Latin version of the Bible, are well known; Wolfgang Musculus, who had been the deceased professor's friend, an excellent commentator on the Scriptures, and a translator of several works of the Greek Fathers; and Theodore Bibliander, distinguished not only by his expositions of the sacred volume, but by his version of the Koran, with discourses in refutation of it. To these [1] Cranmer himself subjoined the name of Brentius, an eminent theologian of Germany, to whom à Lasco objected as [2] differing from the archbishop and himself in the doctrine of the Eucharist, alluding perhaps to the sacramental controversy that now was revived with acrimony, in which Brentius sided with the followers of Luther. To the three former, however, invitations were sent by à Lasco; but they were not accepted. Castalio was a [3] second time invited; and with him the ingenious and learned Italian, [4] Celio

[1] "Ipse verò (Cranmerus) addebat et Brentium." Ibid.

[2] "Cùm illum in caussa sacramentaria non consentire nobiscum dicerem, respondit Cranmerus, illum de hac re jam admonitum esse." Ibid.

[3] Ibid. 474.

[4] Of this distinguished Reformer see what is said, p. 199. It has been related of him, that when pursued by the familiars of the Inquisition at Rome, "he was sitting at dinner in an inn; and

Secundo Curio. The cost of their journey hither was [1] offered to be defrayed, and preferment was promised to follow their arrival; but they came not.

Alexander Aless, of Scotland, has been [2] represented as now among Cranmer's guests. But, though patronized by the archbishop many years [3] before, and then distinguished so highly by his learning, as to obtain the title of *the king's scholar*, he had long since returned to Germany, and been appointed a professor in the University of Leipsic. [4] He had now translated our first service-book into Latin, of which [5] Bucer made use in the intended review of that book, as Peter Martyr did

that a captain of the papal band, called in Italy Barisello, suddenly making his appearance, commanded him in the pope's name to yield himself as a prisoner. Curio, despairing of escape, rose to deliver himself up, unconsciously retaining in his hand the knife with which he had been carving. The Barisello seeing an athletic figure approaching him with a large carving knife, was seized with a sudden panic, and retreated to a corner of the room; upon which Curio, who possessed great presence of mind, walked deliberately out, passed without interruption through the midst of the armed men who were stationed at the door, took his horse from the stable, and made good his flight." M'Crie, Hist. Ref. in Italy, 200.

[1] Epist. à Lasco, ut supr. 474.

[2] By Gilpin, Life of Cranmer, 133.

[3] In 1535. See vol. i. p. 149.

[4] This translation has by some modern writers been inaccurately ascribed to John à Lasco.

[5] Burnet. Strype. Wheatly.

of another translation by Sir John Cheke. Other services of Aless as a Reformer are recorded. In 1535 he read lectures on divinity at Cambridge, but, being there opposed by the Roman Catholic party, returned to London, studied medicine, and then repaired again to Germany, whither he had fled [1] before from persecution in his own country. He had published in 1533 a [2] letter against the decree of those bishops in Scotland, who prohibited the use of the New Testament in the vernacular tongue; and afterwards a [3] treatise "of the authority of the Word of God against the bishop of London, (Stokesley,) wherein are contained certain disputations had in the parliament house between the bishops, about the [4] number of the sacraments, and other things very necessary to be known." His skill in composition must have been of very high character, if, as Strype represents it, "Melancthon made use of him in composing his thoughts into a handsome style, as did another great light of the same nation, I mean Bucer." And yet Melancthon has been celebrated for the purity of his diction, as well as his acquaintance with all kinds of learning. The belief of this literary aid may have been hastily formed from

[1] See vol. i. p. 149.

[2] Ames, 574. Alex. Alesii Epistola contra decretum quoddam episcoporum in Scotia, quod prohibet legere Novi Testamenti libros lingua vernacula. Uncertain where printed.

[3] Wordsworth, Ecc. Biog. ii. 303.

[4] See vol. i. p. 162.

the circumstance of Melancthon having furnished Aless, for a treatise which he wrote to vindicate Protestants from the charge of schism brought against them by Romanists, both with matter and argument, which Aless would adapt to his own manner of writing. Then as to Bucer, Strype offers no other proof of the assistance alleged, than that the professor had written a book in German about the ordination to the ministry in this kingdom, which Aless turned into Latin, and published "for the consolation of the Churches every where in those sad times," as it ran in the title; but Bucer wrote no such work. Had Strype looked beyond *the title of the treatise*, "[1] he could not have fallen into so unaccountable an error. Among the Scripta Anglicana of Bucer, occurs the following: 'Ordinatio Ecclesiæ, seu Ministerii Ecclesiastici, in florentissimo regno Angliæ, conscripta sermone patrio, et in Latinam linguam bona fide conversa, et ad consolationem Ecclesiarum Christi ubicunque locorum ac gentium, his tristibus temporibus, edita ab Alex. Alessio.' This is no other than a translation of our own Common Prayer Book, as originally compiled into Latin; a translation which Bucer, who was unacquainted with English, used in the observations which he made upon it, previously to its revision by a committee of bishops and divines in the latter part of Edward's reign."

[1] Abp. Laurence, Bampton Lect. 218.

CHAPTER IX.

1549 to 1551.

Cranmer's foreign correspondence—Design of a general union among the Protestant Churches—Cranmer's endeavours to this purpose—Writes to Melancthon, Calvin, and Bullinger, on the subject—Bullinger's address to Edward VI.—Character of Bullinger's sermons—Character of Cranmer's sermons—Bucer on the concord of the Protestant Churches—Cranmer resolves on a national confession of faith—Hooper promoted to the see of Gloucester—refuses at first to be consecrated in the usual episcopal dress—Conduct of Cranmer on this occasion—The controversy as to the habits—Hooper submits—The controversy as to the altars—The bishops Day and Heath deprived in consequence of that controversy.

A correspondence with other great Reformers, and with most of the learned men in Europe, Cranmer had now long held. It was so [1] extensive, that at Canterbury he had fixed an agent to forward and receive the communications. From

[1] Strype.

many foreign dependants on his bounty too, in Germany more especially, he would obtain frequent intelligence. There he had assigned to many scholars, in the reign of Henry, an annual salary to aid their studies in the cause of Protestantism. The celebrated John Sleidan, of that country, he was now prompting to proceed with his history of the Reformation, and soon procured for him the encouragement of a considerable pension from the sovereign of our own country.

The design of a general union among the Protestant Churches had now been suggested. The foreign Reformers had beheld with great satisfaction the opening of Edward's reign, and are [1] said to have soon afterwards addressed him upon the projected alliance, offering to place him at the head of it, and to adopt our form of episcopal government. Calvin, Bullinger, and others, are [2] stated as the framers of this plan, and to have thus excited the fears of the Romish hierarchy, that the success of it would lead to her fall. Melancthon had long before repeatedly expressed the wish, that an authoritative standard of doctrine and discipline might be established by a general

[1] Strype, Life of Cranm. B. 2, ch. 15, where he merely refers to Foxes and Firebrands, Part II., in which the information is gathered from a letter preserved by Sir Henry Sidney, which he had met with in Queen Elizabeth's closet, among other papers that had belonged to queen Mary.

[2] Foxes and Firebrands, &c. edit. 1682, P. II. p. 12.

congress of Reformed divines. Such was also the union that Cranmer, from 1548 to 1550, in vain laboured to effect. To Melancthon he first frankly stated his belief, that the wide differences among Protestants, in regard to the sacraments, the divine decrees, and ecclesiastical government, were to their enemies the cause of censure, and to their friends of sorrow. He therefore trusted that a friendly debate, by learned theologians of the several Churches, upon the points of controversy, might lead to the desired coalition. To Calvin, and to Bullinger, he afterwards applied with similar earnestness, proposing England as a place where the consultations might be held with greatest safety.

Melancthon answered, If my judgment and opinion were required, on such an occasion, I should be willing to hear both the sense of other learned men, and to speak my own, giving my reasons, [1] *persuading and being persuaded,* as it ought to be in a conference of good men ; allowing truth, and the glory of God, and the safety of the Church, not any private affection, to bear away the palm. The more I consider your proposal, he continued, the more I wish you to publish, in conformity to the judgment of learned men, a clear Confession of Christian doctrine, to which their names should be subscribed. The Confession, which we of

[1] Τὰ μὲν πείθων, τὰ δὲ πειθόμενος. Melancth. Epist. Strype.

Germany signed at Augsburg, may be your model; some ambiguous expressions in it being avoided: Ambiguities might hereafter occasion new differences: In the Church it is best to call a spade a spade, and not to cast an apple of contention before posterity.—In a second letter, Melancthon reminded the archbishop, that perspicuity of meaning, and precision of language, instead of suffering controverted points to pass under dubious expressions, were absolutely requisite in order to the attainment of the proposed agreement. The Council of Trent, he said, made decrees which allowed them to defend their errors by things ambiguously spoken: But far from the true Church should be such sophistry: In truth rightly propounded there is no absurdity; on the contrary, there is every thing that can attract and gratify ingenuous minds. The invitation to England, however, Melancthon acknowledged only by words.

Nor did Calvin assent to the propriety of Cranmer's scheme any further than in prayers for its success. He [1] wished for a meeting, he said, of the heads of the Reformed Churches. For himself, if he might be thought of any use, he would readily, were he able, pass over ten seas to join them; but his personal weakness must plead for his absence.

The answer of Bullinger to Cranmer, upon this

[1] Calvini Epist. Strype.

occasion, is not preserved. Bullinger, however, about this time, distinguished himself in the cause of the English Reformation by dedicating to the young sovereign the third and fourth decades of his Latin sermons, published at Zurich in 1550, and by earnestly entreating him to proceed in "[1] reforming the Church of Christ in his most happy England, by the true and absolute instrument of truth, the Book of God's Holy Word." He reminded Edward, that, about twelve years before, he had dedicated to his father Henry "[2] a book touching the authority of the Holy Scripture, and the institution and function of bishops, against the pontifical chuffs of the Romish superstition and tyranny;" a labour, he says, which had now brought forth no small fruit within his realm. He spoke of the efficacy of preaching in promoting the Reformation: I handle not, he says, the least and lowest points of Christian religion; I handle the Law, the Gospel, sin, grace, and repentance, to further the cause of true religion, which now beginneth to bud in England, to the great rejoicing of all good people. I have therefore so enlarged these sermons, that of one more may be formed, as the discretion of pastors shall judge expedient

[1] Transl. of his Sermons, p. 603.

[2] Ibid. 258. It appears to have been well received by the king. Cranmer presented it to him. See Epist. de Primordiis Reform. Eccles. inter Dudithii Orationes, Epistolas, &c. Offenbachii, 1610, p. 223.

for their respective congregations.—These sermons of Bullinger, let me add, if not in the reign of Edward, were in that of Elizabeth, translated; and by archbishop Whitgift were [1] directed to be studied by the clergy; the energy, as well as the perspicuity, which so often distinguishes them, being considered a model, that the preacher might serviceably follow. Had the discourses of Cranmer been printed, the same public distinction would doubtless have attended them. The character of them, which has descended to us, for utility cannot be exceeded. "The subjects of his sermons," a frequent [2] auditor of them has told us, "for the most part were from whence salvation is to be fetched, and on whom the confidence of man ought to lean. They insisted much on doctrines of faith and works; and taught what the fruits of faith were, and what place was to be given to works. They instructed men in the duties they owed their neighbour; and that every one was our neighbour, to whom we might any way do good. They declared what men ought to think of themselves, after they had done all; and, lastly, what promises Christ hath made, and who they are to whom he will make them good. Thus he brought in the true preaching of the Gospel, altogether different from the ordinary way of preaching in those days, which was to treat con-

[1] Strype's Life of Abp. Whitgift. Append. B. 3. No. 32.

[2] Sir Richard Morison. Gilpin, 161.

cerning saints, to tell legendary tales of them, and to report miracles wrought for the confirmation of transubstantiation and other popish corruptions. And such a heat of conviction accompanied his sermons, that the people departed from them with minds possessed of a great hatred of vice, and burning with a desire of virtue."—Thus also bishop Burnet, who had seen the greatest part of a sermon, which, in 1549, Cranmer had preached at court, pronounced it "a very plain, impartial discourse, without any shew of learning or conceits of wit. He severely expostulates in the Name of God, with his hearers, for their ill lives, their blasphemies, adulteries, mutual hatred, oppression, and contempt of the Gospel; and complains of the slackness of government in punishing these sins, by which it became, in some sort, guilty of them."

The wish of Cranmer for the general union among the Protestant Churches had been communicated, there can be no doubt, to all the foreign Reformers who visited him. Than Bucer, in particular, these Churches possessed no friend more strenuous for their concord. The subject, indeed, had often [1] employed his pen. But with

[1] As in his letters. His labour also, to this purpose, is contained in a little volume of extreme rarity, printed at Paris in 1607, entitled, "P. Melancthonis, M. Buceri, et Casp. Hedionis, aliorumque in Germania theologorum, de pace Ecclesiæ sententiæ." Gerdesii Floril. 248. Caspar Hedio was a Reformer who had distinguished himself at Mentz and at Strasburg.

whatever persons the archbishop consulted upon the point he had so much at heart, the [1] perplexities of the times occasioned the intention to be abandoned soon after it had been imparted. The resolution, however, of assembling the divines of his own Church, and of preparing with them a national confession of faith, was the consequence of this disappointment. Again he, therefore, [2] wrote to Calvin, who replied, that since the times were adverse to the accomplishment of his more extensive design, that which respected only his own country was judicious, and, when completed, might preserve the minds of the people from wavering in religion; that such employment, indeed, was worthy of him, the eyes of good men being fixed upon his example, either to follow his exertions, or to remain idle on the plea of his inactivity. But before the book of Articles, now designed by Cranmer for preserving the peace and unity of our own Church, was completed, there was a considerable lapse of time. Meanwhile, a schism occurred within it, occasioned by the promotion of Hooper, afterwards the martyr, to the see of Gloucester.

Hooper was one of those who at Oxford, in the reign of Henry, had opposed the papal doctrines. To avoid the tyranny of the Six Articles, he fled from his country, and fixed himself at Zurich till

[1] The Interim. See before, p. 44. [2] Strype.

the accession of Edward. Returning then to England, he became popular as a preacher, and with the approbation of Cranmer was advanced to the episcopal dignity. But, like most of the Helvetic divines, Hooper objected to the episcopal dress. He scrupled also, as [1] some assert, to take the oath of canonical obedience to the archbishop; of supremacy to the sovereign, according to [2] others. Without submission to these forms Cranmer refused to consecrate him. The earl of Warwick in vain applied to the primate, "[3] desiring a forbearance of those things, which the bishop elect of Gloucester craved to be forborne at his hands, and not to charge him with any oath that seemed burdenous to his conscience." Warwick added, that such was also the king's desire. Cranmer persisted in his denial; and more than two months had passed since the new prelate was nominated, when the king himself was prevailed upon thus to address the archbishop, and thus justly to characterize Hooper.

"[4] Right reverend father, We greet you well. Whereas, by the advice of our Council, We have called and chosen our right well-beloved and well-worthy Mr. John Hooper, professor of divinity, to be our bishop of Gloucester, as well for

[1] Heylin. [2] A. Wood.
[3] Heylin. [4] Ibid.

his great learning, deep judgment, and long study, both in the Scriptures and other profound learning; as also for his good discretion, ready utterance, and honest life for that kind of vocation; from consecrating whom We understand you do stay, because he would have you omit and let pass certain rites and ceremonies offensive to his conscience, whereby you think you should fall in *premunire* of our laws: We have therefore thought good, by the advice aforesaid, to dispense, and discharge you of all manner of dangers, penalties, and forfeitures, you should run into and be in, in any manner of way, by omitting any of the same. And this our letter shall be your sufficient warrant. Given at our Castle of Windsor the 5th day of August, in the fourth year of our reign."

Ridley advised Cranmer to request, in answer to this gracious letter, that he might not now obey his sovereign against his own laws. The request was granted. But Hooper continued inflexible. He now entered into controversy on the subject with Ridley; and the Privy Council interfered. On the 6th of October, 1550, the lords of the Council [1] wrote to Ridley, stating their wish that there might not be disputes between men of the same profession, and desiring him to forbear the present. The influence of Warwick had occasioned this direction to the

[1] Council-book. Hen. Wharton, 94.

bishop of London, who replied that he requested to submit to the lords the arguments he had formed upon the subject. To this they agreed. Hooper now sought the advice of Peter Martyr and Bucer; and to the latter, who was then at Cambridge, Cranmer also, still unwilling to proceed upon his own judgment, thus referred the question.

"[1] After my hearty salutations, right well-beloved Master Bucer. I have read that book which you have sent to doctor Peter Alexander, concerning the controversy betwixt Master Hooper and the bishop of London. In which book many things are learnedly declared, and largely handled. Wherefore now I pray you, that you would send unto me your judgment of these questions, expressed with as short brevity of words as you can.

"Whether, without the offence of God, it may be lawful to the ministers of the Church of England, to use those vestures which at these days they wear, and so are prescribed of the magistrate?

"Whether he that shall affirm that it is unlaw-

[1] This is a translation of Cranmer's Latin epistle to Bucer, and is copied from a curious pamphlet, printed in 1564, entitled "A brief Examination for the time of a certain declaration lately put in print, in the name and defence of certain ministers of London refusing to wear the apparel prescribed by the laws of the realm."

ful, or [1] shall refuse to wear this apparel, offendeth against God, for that he sayeth that thing to be unclean that God hath sanctified; and offendeth against the magistrate, for that he disturbeth the politic order?

"To these questions, if you will make most brief answer, and send unto me your judgment as soon as you may possibly, you shall do me great pleasure. God be with you. From Lambeth, the second of December, [1550.]"

The answer of Bucer, [2] dated the tenth of that month, affirmed that the habits might be lawfully worn, "forasmuch as it is thought good to the king's Majesty, and to the chief Council of the realm, to retain the use of these vestures for the present; and that they who deny the use of such apparel to be lawful, are in error, as they deny all things to be holy to them that are sanctified;—that the use of them here is received neither upon superstitious nor light cause, and that they who resisted the direction of the magistrate disturbed the public order." Bucer too, on this occasion, [3] remonstrated with John à Lasco, who

[1] Burnet omits these words *or shall refuse*. The original, however, has *aut recusarit*. H. Wharton, 93.

[2] A brief Examination, ut supr. This letter also, and that of P. Martyr which is presently cited, as well as Cranmer's, are translations.

[3] A brief Examination, ut supr.

applauded the resistance of Hooper not without severe reflections upon those of a contrary opinion. Bucer argued "that the use of bells was a mark of antichristianity in our churches, when the people by them were called to masses, and when they were rung against tempests, but now they were a token of Christianity, the people by them being gathered together to the Gospel of Christ and other holy actions. Why may it not then be that the self-same garments may serve godlily with godly men, that was of wicked signification with the ungodly? Truly, I know very many ministers of Christ, most godly men, who have used godlily these vestures, and at this day do yet use them; so that I dare not for this cause ascribe unto them any fault at all."

To the objections of Hooper against the vestments as relics of Judaism, and as having been used in the service of the Romish mass, Martyr also largely replied from Oxford. Though he wished that the garments might be "[1] laid aside," (himself also appears to have been [2] unwilling at Oxford to wear them,) still, until "better may be, we ought," he said, "to bear them." Nor did he scruple to caution Hooper "[3] not to bring the

[1] A brief Examination, ut supr.

[2] "Nunquam uti volui." Epist. Mart. Heylin, 92.

[3] A brief Examination, ut supr. Bullinger declared it lawful also for the ministers of the Church of England to wear the apparel prescribed. His treatise to this purpose was published

Church of Christ into such bondage, that it may not use any thing that the pope used." The authority of Martyr, and of Bucer also, I may add, for the distinct use of ministerial apparel, is repeatedly enforced against the non-conformists, in the reign of James the first, by Moreton, bishop of Chester, in his valuable "[1] defence of the innocency of the ceremonies of the Church of England."

But to the arguments of Bucer and Martyr as to those of Cranmer and Ridley, Hooper would not as yet in any point submit. For we find, that on the 13th of January, 1551, "[2] Mr. Hooper, bishop elect of Gloucester, appeared before the Council touching his old matter of denying to wear such apparel as other bishops wear; and having been before commanded to keep his house, unless it were to go to the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishops of Ely, London, or Lincoln, for satisfaction or counsel of his conscience in that matter; and further, neither to preach, nor read, until he had licence from the Council; it appeared both that he had not kept his house, and that he had also written and printed a book wherein was contained matter that he should not have written. For the which, and for that also he persevered in his former opinion of not wearing the bishops' apparel, he was now *committed to the archbishop*

in Latin and English in 1566, when the controversy as to the habits was violent.

[1] A Defence, &c. ut supr. Lond. 1618. pp. 205—213.

[2] Council-book, ut supr. H. Wharton, 94.

of Canterbury's custody, either there to be reformed, or further to be punished, as the obstinacy of his case required." Even the gentleness of Cranmer continued to be ineffectual. The proceedings of the Council state, that " on the 27th of January a letter from the archbishop of Canterbury acquainted them, that Mr. Hooper cannot be brought to any conformity, but rather, persevering in his obstinacy, coveteth to prescribe orders and necessary laws of his own head; and it was therefore agreed that he should be committed to the Fleet, and that the warden of the prison should keep him from conference of any person, except the minister of that house."

Ere six weeks more had passed, the matter was brought to a compromise; and he was consecrated on the 8th of March, in the [1] rochet and chimere, the usual vestments of a bishop, which had been so obnoxious to him, and which he now consented to wear in his cathedral, and upon public occasions. The square cap, as well as other clerical habits, had given rise, at this time also, to abundant controversy. To the cap, however, Hooper in like manner occasionally submitted.

[1] The rochet is the white linen garment, which had been the episcopal dress of the early ages, and is still continued. The chimere is the robe to which the lawn sleeves are generally sewed, and was, when Hooper started at it, of scarlet silk. In the reign of Elizabeth the scarlet silk was changed to black satin, which is the present robe of a bishop.

In the early part of the year, which had been thus distinguished by Hooper's objections to dress, he had been more successful in the choice of another subject for his preaching, which, however, gave rise to another controversy. He declared before the court, "[1] that it would be well if the government would turn altars into tables, according to the first institution of Christ, in order to take away the false persuasion of the people, which they have of sacrifice to be done upon altars; for, as long as altars remain, both the ignorant people and the ignorant and ill-persuaded priest will always dream of sacrifices." Herein Ridley agreed with him; and accordingly, in June, 1550, when he held his primary visitation, he [2] enjoined the altars to be taken down in his diocese of London, and tables to be placed in their stead, "to turn the simple from the old superstitions of the popish mass, and to the right use of the Lord's Supper." To such an injunction the Romish party naturally excited all the opposition in their power. The Council then interfered; and in a letter to Ridley in the following November, signed by Cranmer and others, corroborated what he had directed, and to the other prelates issued a mandate for their conformity to his example. But the order was not by all of them obeyed. In particular, Day, bishop

[1] Heylin. [2] Burnet.

of Chichester, who had publicly declared his resistance to such a change, when Hooper's discourse and Ridley's precept became generally known, now resolved to disobey it. Nor could the conference of Cranmer and other prelates with him, conquer his non-conformity. In the month of December, he was therefore committed to the Fleet, and before the next year ended was deprived of his bishopric; to which he was restored on the accession of Mary, in whose reign his actions proved, that while in earlier days he had professed to be a Reformer, he was in reality a zealous Roman Catholic.

Heath, bishop of Worcester, who was still imprisoned for his [1] disobedience in regard to the Ordinal, was at the same time deprived of his see. To that public formulary he now again declined his assent, and added, that "[2] if he were demanded to take down altars and set up tables, he would refuse." He too, in the reign of Mary, recovered his rank, and was advanced to the archbishopric of York. Thus to the opinion, that an altar was necessary *for the celebration of mass*, two prelates now sacrificed their possessions; the Reformers judging the removal of the altar to be necessary for abolishing the Romish opinion, and the substitution of a table to be more in conformity to primitive practice. Nor was the posi-

[1] See before, p. 170.

[2] Council-book.

tion of the table now always where the altar stood, which was at the east end of the chancel; in some churches the middle of the chancel being chosen for it. Through the reign of Edward other diversity of usage in this respect obtained. The accession of Mary restored the altars which had been removed; that of Elizabeth prudently constituted little difference between the altar and the table, and thus checked the undiscerning fury of the people, again freed from the shackles of Rome, in their demolition of what had acquired in the time of Edward an anti-protestant designation. Her injunction declared it to be "no matter of great moment, whether there were altars or tables, so that the sacrament was duly and reverently administered;" and ordered, "that where an altar was taken down, a holy table should be decently made, and set in the place where the altar stood." The altar-controversy, however, was afterwards revived, and lasted till the Great Rebellion.

CHAPTER X.

1550 to 1551.

The archbishop's book upon the sacrament of the Lord's Supper—Frith's book upon the same subject—The answers of bishop Gardiner, now a prisoner in the Tower, and of Dr. Smith, to the archbishop's book—Proceedings against Gardiner—The archbishop's reply to him and to Smith—An explanation of Luther considered—Differently applied by Cranmer.

WHILE the preceding controversies were agitated, Cranmer was employed upon a labour of loftier character and of more important effect, his "Defence of the true and catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ; with a confutation of sundry errors concerning the same; grounded and established upon God's Holy Word, and approved by the consent of the most ancient doctors of the Church." It was first published in 1550. So eager was the demand for the work, that in the same year [1] three impressions of it appeared; and many, who had hitherto opposed, were soon led by this invaluable book to embrace, the Protestant doctrine.

[1] Herbert. See Dibdin's Typograph. Antiq. iv. 13.

In the preface the archbishop refers to what "was of late years the face of religion within this realm of England, and yet remaineth in divers realms;" the indulgences, beads, pardons, and pilgrimages; hypocrisy and superstition instead of true and sincere religion. "But thanks be to Almighty God," he continues, "and to the king's Majesty with his father, a prince of most famous memory, the superstitious sects of monks and friars that were in this realm be clean taken away; the Scripture is restored unto the proper and true understanding; the people may daily read and hear God's heavenly Word, and pray in their own language which they understand, so that their hearts and mouths may go together, and they be none of those people of whom Christ complained, saying, *These people honour me with their lips, but their hearts be far from me.* Thanks be to God, many corrupt weeds be plucked up, which were wont to rot the flock of Christ, and to let the growing of the Lord's harvest. But what availeth it to take away beads, pardons, pilgrimages, and such other like popery, so long as the chief roots remain unpulled up, whereof, so long as they remain, will spring again all former impediments of the Lord's harvest, and corruptions of his flock? The rest is but branches and leaves, the cutting away whereof is but like topping and lopping of a tree, or cutting down of weeds, leaving the body standing, and the roots

in the ground: but the very body of the tree, or rather the roots of the weeds, is *the popish doctrine of transubstantiation, of the real presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the altar (as they call it,) and of the sacrifice and oblation of Christ, made by the priest for the salvation of the quick and the dead.* Which roots, if they be suffered to grow in the Lord's vineyard, they will overspread all the ground again with the old errors and superstitions. These injuries to Christ are so intolerable, that no Christian heart can willingly bear them. Wherefore seeing that many have set to their hands, and whetted their tools, to pluck up the weeds, and to cut down the tree of error, I, not knowing otherwise how to excuse myself at the last day, have in this book set to my hand and axe with the rest to cut down this tree, and to pluck up the weeds and plants by the roots, which our heavenly Father never planted, but were grafted and sown in His vineyard by His adversary the devil, and antichrist his minister. The Lord grant that this my travail and labour in His vineyard be not in vain, but that it may prosper and bring forth good fruits to His honour and glory. For when I see His vineyard overgrown with thorns, brambles, and weeds, I know that everlasting woe appertaineth to me if I hold my peace, and put not to my hands and tongue to labour in purging His vineyard. God I take to witness, who seeth the

hearts of all men truly unto the bottom, that I take this labour for none other consideration but for the glory of His Name, and the discharge of my duty, and the zeal that I bear toward the flock of Christ. I know in what office God hath placed me, and to what purpose; that is to say, to set forth His Word truly unto His people, to the uttermost of my power, without respect of person, or regard of any thing in the world, but of Him alone. I know what account I shall make to Him hereof at the last day, when every man shall answer for his vocation, and receive for the same good or ill, according as he hath done."

This book is divided into five parts. The first treats of the abuse of the Lord's Supper, and then gives an account of the true Eucharistic doctrine; briefly referring to the Romish errors which are subjects of the following parts, transubstantiation, the presence of Christ in the sacrament, that evil men eat and drink the very body and blood of Christ, and that Christ is offered every day for remission of sins.

The second, therefore, proceeds to confute at large the error of transubstantiation, shewing that it is contrary to God's Word, to reason, to our senses, and to the belief of the Fathers; with a luminous account of writings wrested against their meaning in support of the doctrine, and with an exposure of absurdities that the doctrine maintains.

"What Christian ears," he exclaims, "can patiently hear this doctrine, that Christ is every day made anew, and made of another substance than he was made of in his mother's womb. For whereas, at his incarnation he was made of the nature and substance of his Blessed Mother, now by these papists' opinion, he is made every day of the nature and substance of bread and wine, which, as they say, are turned into the substance of his body and blood."

The third part teaches the manner how Christ is present in his Holy Supper; that corporally he is ascended into heaven; that, at one time, one body cannot be in divers places; that Christ calling bread his body, and wine his blood, are figurative speeches; that to eat his flesh and drink his blood, are the same; that the bread represents his body, and the wine his blood; that figurative speeches are not strange; and that Christ himself uses them. When, in the following year, Cranmer reprinted his book, he thus perspicuously, in an additional preface, that his meaning might not be mistaken, condensed the reasonings that are urged in this third part of the Defence. "Where I use to speak sometimes as the old authors do, that Christ is in the sacraments, I mean the same as they did understand the matter; that is to say, not of Christ's carnal presence in the outward sacrament, but sometimes of his sacramental presence. And sometimes by

this word, sacrament, I mean the whole ministration and receiving of the sacraments, either of Baptism or of the Lord's Supper. And so the old writers many times do say, that Christ and the Holy Ghost be present in the sacraments, not meaning by that manner of speech that Christ and the Holy Ghost be present in the water, bread, or wine, which be only the outward visible sacraments; but that in the due ministration of the sacraments, according to Christ's ordinance and institution, Christ and his Holy Spirit be truly and indeed present by their mighty and sanctifying power, virtue, and grace, in all them that worthily receive the same. Moreover, when I say and repeat many times in my book, that the body of Christ is present in them that worthily receive the sacrament, lest any man should mistake my words, and think that I mean, that although Christ be not corporally in the outward visible signs, yet he is corporally in the persons that duly receive them; this is to advertise the reader, that I mean no such thing; but my meaning is, that the force, the grace, the virtue, and benefit of Christ's body that was crucified for us, and of his blood that was shed for us, be really and effectually present with all them that duly receive the sacraments. But all this I understand of his spiritual presence, of the which he saith, *I will be with you unto the world's end;* and *Wheresoever two or three be gathered together in my*

name, there am I in the midst of them; and *He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.* And no more truly is he corporally or really present in the due ministration of the Lord's Supper, than he is in the due ministration of Baptism."

The fourth part denies, in opposition to the Romish tenet, that evil men partake of the body and blood of Christ; and proceeds to combat another papistical error, when "in the stead of Christ himself, the sacrament is worshipped: For as his humanity, joined to his divinity, and exalted to the right hand of his Father, is to be worshipped of all creatures in heaven, in earth, and under the earth; even so, if in the stead thereof we worship the signs and sacraments, we commit as great idolatry as ever was, or shall be, to the world's end."

The fifth and last part attacks the sacrifice of the Romish mass; declares that in the Primitive Church there were no such masses; that "such priests as pretend to be Christ's successors, in making a sacrifice of him, are his most heinous adversaries, for no person ever made a sacrifice of Christ, but himself only;" that the death of Christ is the only oblation and sacrifice, whereby our sins are pardoned; that the Fathers of the Church, when they "called the mass, or supper of the Lord, a sacrifice, they meant that it was a sacrifice of laud and thanksgiving, (and so as well

the people as the priest do sacrifice,) or else that it was a remembrance of the very true sacrifice propitiatory of Christ; but they meant it in no wise that it is a very true sacrifice for sin, and applicable by the priest to the quick and dead;" and that therefore "wicked are the inventions of a purgatory to torment souls after this life, and oblations of masses said by the priests to deliver them from the said torments."

Written as this book was by Cranmer in his mature age, after all his great reading, and all his diligent study of the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, with whose judgments and opinions in the doctrine he thus became intimately acquainted; it is, as Strype has justly concluded, the more to be valued. With that ingenuousness, however, which was so distinguishing a part of his character, he [1] acknowledged that from the "Book made in 1533, by John Frith, prisoner in the Tower of London, in answer to Sir Thomas More, concerning the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ," he had received great light, and derived several arguments, upon the subject. The answer of Frith to the illustrious champion of the Romish party, is indeed, to a small extent, an anticipation, as it were, of the archbishop's book; and is to be admired for its prudence and moderation, as well as for its acuteness and learn-

[1] Burnet. See also before, vol. i. p. 86.

ing. It is no wonder, therefore, awakening also, as it must have done, the remembrance that in former days he had [1] endeavoured to draw the author from his belief, it should have engaged, amongst the numerous writings on the point before him, the attention of the archbishop. Frith, like Cranmer, admitted not the Lutheran tenet of consubstantiation; which indeed, in England, never made much progress. It is obvious, throughout his answer, that with Bertram, and Wicliffe, and Oecolampadius, and Zuinglius, not with those "[2] Germans who think that the natural body of Christ is present in the sacrament, and take the words fleshly, as Martin Luther taught them," he concurred.

The discourse of the archbishop upon the sacrament was no sooner published, than it was attacked by bishop Gardiner, then a prisoner in the Tower, and by Dr. Smith, then a fugitive at Louvain. Gardiner had now been confined two years. Still he refused submission to what the Council required of him, and still they denied a legal trial which he of them demanded. Commissioners were at length appointed to examine him. These were the archbishop, the bishops of London, Ely, and Lincoln, secretary Petre, judge Hales, two civilians, and two masters of chancery.

[1] See before, vol. i. p. 86.

[2] Frith's Answer to Sir T. More.

He had been allowed by the Council three months to consider whether he would subscribe, as the king had commanded; the deprivation of his bishopric being resolved on, if within that time he did not submit. He was required to approve of the new service-book; the ordinal; the marriage of the clergy; the homilies which he had [1] impugned; the paraphrase which he had [2] condemned; the demolition of images; the prohibition of the mass; and, what himself indeed [3] promoted in the former reign, the dissolution of monasteries. But his obstinacy was not thus to be subdued. Before the commissioners he was now to appear; and, "[4] after a great deal of pains and patience" on their part, "he was by the archbishop and the rest of the commissioners deprived, *after no less than two and twenty sessions held at divers places*, that is, from the 15th of December, 1550, to the 14th of February, 1551; though Stow falsely names but seven." He who reads the account of this examination only in Dr. Lingard's recent history of our country,

[1] See before, in the present vol. p. 12.

[2] Ibid. p. 16.

[3] See before, vol. i. p. 272. Burnet tells us, that bishop Gardiner was remarkably vehement in declaiming against the monasteries; and that in many of his sermons he commended the king for suppressing them. Warton, Life of Sir T. Pope, p. 40.

[4] Strype.

might imagine that the proceedings were those but of a single session, since he says, omitting to name the many days on which Gardiner was heard in his defence, that "[1] Cranmer *cut short* the proceedings, and pronounced him contumacious." However, at one of these meetings, "[2] to make his cause more plausible, as though he were at this time the public defender of the Roman Catholic cause in England," he alleged that he was now persecuted for his defence of the corporal presence in the sacrament; and that the archbishop in his recent work had named him with no friendly view. He therefore, in open court, delivered to the commissioners his reply to that work, which a press in France had finished for him, as relating to his present case.

This was a disingenuous proceeding, which Cranmer doubtless would immediately expose; and which, in his formal answer to Gardiner's book, he soon unveiled to the public. "The [3] beginning of your book," said the archbishop to this crafty antagonist, "is framed with such

[1] Hist. Eng. 8vo. ed. vii. 87.

[2] Strype.

[3] It was thus entitled, "An explication and assertion of the true catholique fayth, touchyng the moost blessed sacrament of the aulter, with confutacion of a booke written agaynst the same. Made by Steven, byshop of Wynchester, and exhibited by his owne hande for his defence to the kynges maiesties commissioners at Lambeth. Anno 1551."

sleight and subtilty, that it may deceive the reader notably in two things. The one, that he should think you were called into judgment before the King's Majesty's commissioners at Lambeth for your catholic faith in the sacrament: the other, that you made your book for your defence therein. Both which are utterly untrue. For your book was made or ever you were called before the commissioners; and *after you were called, then you altered two lines in the beginning of your book,* and made that beginning which it hath now. This I am able to prove, as well otherwise as by a book which I have of your own handwriting, wherein appeareth plainly the alteration of the beginning. And as concerning the cause wherefore you were called before the commissioners, where by your own importune, suit, and procurement, and as it were enforcing the matter, you were called to justice for your manifest contempt and continual disobediences from time to time, or rather rebellion against the king's Majesty, and were justly deprived of your estate for the same; *you would turn it now to a matter of the sacrament, that the world should think your trouble rose for your faith in the sacrament, which was no matter nor occasion thereof, nor was any such matter objected against you.* And where you would make that matter the occasion of your worthy deprivation and punishment, which was no cause thereof; and cloke your wilful obstinacy

and disobedience, which was the only cause thereof; all men of judgment may well perceive, that you could mean no goodness thereby either to the king's Majesty, or to his realm."

Gardiner, as "[1] he had at all times before the judges of his cause used himself irreverently to the king, and slanderously towards the Council," so, in his book, he spared not, instead of argument, offensive reflections upon Cranmer. He was an able politician; he was "to be numbered among good lawyers," as Foxe describes him, "but to be reckoned also among ignorant and gross divines." In order to the present controversy with the archbishop, he was supplied with weapons from the armoury of his brother-champion, Dr. Smith. Cranmer, in his answer to him, reminded him of these supplies: "Dr. Smith," said he, "informed me, *that you had of him all the authorities that be in your book.*" Again, "I neither willingly go about to deceive the reader in the searching of St. Augustine, as you use to do in every place; *nor have I trusted my man or friend therein, as it seemeth you have done overmuch,* but I have diligently expended and weighed the matter myself. In such weighty matters of Scripture, and ancient authors, you must needs trust your men, *without whom I know you can do very little, being brought up from your*

[1] Council-Book. Strype.

tender age in other kinds of study." He bids him remember too a conversation that had lately passed: "As for the word *corporal*," he says, "you openly confessed your own ignorance in the open audience of all the people at Lambeth, when I asked you what corporal body Christ hath in the sacrament, and whether he had distinction of members or no: Your answer was, in effect, that you could not tell. And yet that was a wiser saying than you spoke before in Cyril, where you said, that Christ hath only a spiritual body, and a spiritual presence, and now you say he hath a corporal presence; and so you confound corporal and spiritual, as if you knew not what either of them meant, or wist not, or cared not, what you said." Often the archbishop also convicts his opponent of "ignorance as great in logic and philosophy, as in [1] divinity;" in stating, too, from "the school-authors," as evidences of their soberness and devotion, what were gross absurdities; and of making "such divinity as he could dream in his sleep, or devise in his own brain, or draw out of the papistical laws and decrees, and for lack of arguments furnishing his book with pretty toys, with glorious boasting, and with scornful taunts."

Having, with Ridley, espoused the doctrine of Zuinglius, in rejecting all corporal and local pre-

[1] Gardiner acknowledged himself to Henry as "*not learned in divinity.*" Strype, Ecc. Mem. i. 148.

sence in the Eucharist, Cranmer had been careful, however, like his learned friend, not to fail in expression, (as the Swiss Reformer is [1] thought to have failed, rather than in real meaning,) concerning a [2] spiritual presence and spiritual graces. Gardiner, although with two-fold evidence of Cranmer's real sentiments upon these graces and this presence before him, repeatedly misrepresented them. "This ignorant lawyer," Cranmer therefore says, "either will not, or cannot, or at least doth not understand what is meant in *the* [3] *Book of Common Prayer*, and in *my Book* also, by the receiving and feeding upon Christ spiritually." What the meaning in both the books is, he therefore repeats in the following words to Gardiner. "[4] I mean not that Christ is spiritually either in the table, or in the bread and wine that are set upon the table, but I mean that he is present in the ministration and receiving of that holy sacrament, according to his own institution and

[1] Abp. Wake, Discourse on the Eucharist, p. 83. Waterland, Rev. of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, ch. 7.

[2] If there be a spiritual grace present to the symbols, that seemed to Erasmus, approving the opinion of Oecolampadius touching the Eucharist, to be sufficient. For I discern not, said he, what good an invisible substance can do there, or how it can profit any one, if it were discernible. Jortin, Erasm. i. 408.

[3] Communion Service, passim.

[4] Answer to Gardiner, 172.

ordinance. Like as in [1] baptism Christ and the Holy Ghost are not in the water or font, but are given in the ministration, or to them that are duly baptized in the water. And although the sacramental tokens are only significations and figures, yet doth Almighty God effectually work in them, that duly receive His sacraments, those divine and celestial operations which He hath promised, and by the sacraments are signified. For else they were vain and unfruitful sacraments as well to the godly, as to the ungodly. And therefore I never said of the whole Supper, that it is but a signification, or a bare memory, of Christ's death, but I teach that it is a spiritual [2] refreshing, wherein our souls are fed and nourished with Christ's very flesh and blood to eternal life."

Luther has often, and justly, been censured for pretending to explain his doctrine of the real presence, absurd and contradictory as it was, by the statement of two distinct substances in red-hot iron, namely, iron and fire united: so with the bread in the Eucharist, said he, is joined the body of Christ. Maclaine, in his notes upon Mosheim,

[1] So Bucer: "Pane enim et vino non aliter utitur hic Dominus, quam aqua in baptismate. Quare hæc symbola (Eucharistica) in sua natura manent immutata, sicut aqua in baptismate." Gerdesii Miscell. iv. 700. So bishop Ponet, in his Diallacticon, who cites Cyprian, Ambrose, and others, in confirmation of this tenet. See also before, p. 242.

[2] As in our Church Catechism.

mentions "this miserable comparison, to shew into what absurdities the towering pride of system will often betray men of deep sense and true genius." Cranmer in his Defence of the true doctrine, it is curious to observe, has however ingeniously propounded the illustration of "[1] hot and burning iron, which is iron still," he says, "and yet hath the force of fire;—so the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their proper kinds, and yet to them that worthily eat and drink them, they are turned, not into the corporal presence," as Luther taught, "but into the virtue of Christ's flesh and blood."

The archbishop's reply to Gardiner, "[2] as occasion serves, answers such places of Dr. Richard Smith, as may seem any thing worthy the answering." Smith, although a learned, was a weak as well as a [3] perfidious man. In the animadversions upon Gardiner often he is therefore incorporated, and sometimes is exposed as contradicting the champion with whom he sided. But the preface to his book receives a distinct answer from the

[1] B. iii. Of the Presence of Christ.

[2] Part of the title of the book.

[3] See before, p. 173. He deserted the Church of Rome, and then returned to it. He was so famous for his repeated inconstancy, private and public, that an opponent, with whom he desired a conference, replied, *I will know whether you will recant any more, ere I talk with you, or believe you.*

archbishop, after the closing page of the controversy with Gardiner.

It was [1] late in the year 1551, when the archbishop's reply to these opponents was allowed to be published. Again it was printed in the following year. And as a proof, not only of the welcome which it had experienced, but of the high character which it maintained, it was re-published in 1580. Archbishop Parker, indeed, has [2] said of it, that no controversy against Romanists was ever handled more accurately; and upon the language as well as the spirit of it, upon its acuteness, as well as its zeal, succeeding writers of distinction have bestowed their eulogy. Nothing could be more fair and candid, than the order in which it was formed. In it was [3] incorporated the whole of his Defence of the true doctrine, and of his

[1] His letter, requesting from Secretary Cecil the requisite licence to publish it, is dated Sept. 29, 1551. Strype.

[2] In his Antiq. Brit.

[3] In this way Crowley's Answer, in 1548, to Miles Hoggard's Ballad in favour of transubstantiation, was given. The ballad was introduced in parcels, and so confuted. Hoggard was a hosier in London, the first trader or mechanic, Anthony Wood says, that appeared in print for the Roman Catholic cause; and his coarseness was the natural consequence of his ignorance. An opponent frankly told him,

"You can better skill to eat a pudding, and make a hose,
"Than in Scripture either to answer, or oppose."

adversary's reply to it. Distinct paragraphs from his own book were first presented to the reader, which were followed by the animadversions of Gardiner, as those were by the archiepiscopal confutations of them. Gardiner returned an answer, while yet in prison, under the feigned name of M. A. Constantius; supplied still more largely than he had been before, with materials for his work, by the industry of others. His new book was accordingly denominated "[1] Pandora's box, to which all the lesser gods brought their presents: for every man, were his learning less or more, that had any arguments for the Romish doctrine, brought them all to him, (many of which were windy and trivial enough,) and out of the heap he made his collections as he thought good." It was published at Louvain in 1552; afterwards it appeared in 1554, with the triumphant[2] addition of Gardiner's real name, Mary being then the sovereign, and himself her chancellor. Cranmer, when he also was in prison, vindicated what had been thus attacked to a very great extent, and intended some addition to that vindication, if it might have been, "before his life," as he

[1] Translation of the Preface to Peter Martyr's book in defence of Cranmer. Strype.

[2] Confutatio cavillationum quibus sacrosanctum Eucharistiæ sacramentum ab impiis Capharnaitis impeti solet. Authore Stephano Winton. Episcopo, Angliæ Cancellario. *Editio altera*, cui index accedit locupletissimus. 8vo. Lovanii. 1544.

said, " were taken away, which he saw was likely to be within a very short space." After that event, Peter Martyr, indeed, appeared as his [1] acute and elaborate defender. His own vindication is [2] supposed to be lost.

But as Gardiner, under the assumed title of M. A. Constantius, had so unfairly proceeded with Cranmer's book as to [3] confound the method of it, and to disjoin and mangle passages in subserviency only to his own objections; the archbishop was of opinion, that if learned foreigners saw his *Defence of the true doctrine* translated into the Latin tongue, (as the second attack of Gardiner was written in that language,) it would sufficiently vindicate him in their judgment and esteem. Sir John Cheke elegantly performed this service for the archbishop; and the Defence in Latin, with

[1] Simler, in his Life of P. Martyr, reports the admiration bestowed on this defence by men of learning. Martyr himself, in a letter to Utenhovius, tells him, that he has sent him the book in which he has confuted the fallacies and the tricks of Gardiner, in this Eucharistic controversy. Gerdesii Miscell. iv. 675.

[2] " He lived long enough to finish three parts, whereof two unhappily perished at Oxford, and the third fell into John Foxe's hands, and, for aught I know, that by this time is perished also." Strype.

[3] " Constantius argumenta mea—sæpè truncata, sæpè inversa, sæpè disjecta, sic introducit, ut non magis à me agnosci potuerint, quàm Medeæ liberi in multa membra disjecti et deformati." Cranmer's Letter to Edward.

some additions, appeared in 1553; as it also again appeared in 1557, with observations which had been made upon a review of this translation by the archbishop himself in prison, and which had fallen into the hands of the [1] English exiles at Embden, who offered in this publication their grateful sense of duty to the memory of the martyred primate. Prefixed to this translation is a Latin epistle from Cranmer to King Edward VI., dated in March, 1553, in which he says, that "it was his care of the Lord's flock committed to him, which induced him to renew and restore the Lord's Supper according to the institution of Christ: which was the reason that, about three years before, he had set forth a book in English against the principal abuses of the papistical mass."

Collections of Cranmer upon this great subject, all of which were probably made before the Defence was formed, yet remain in the [2] libraries of

[1] "Ut ne autem de hujus libelli vel fide, vel autore, dubites, amice lector, *autographon ejus* in nostra apud Emdanos ecclesia *pro thesauro quodam et clarissimi viri sanctique Christi martyris mnemosyno servamus.*" Preface by the Exiles, sign. A. 5. b.

[2] Many of them have been copied by Burnet, Strype, and Collier, from the two volumes of his collections in the Lambeth library, No. 1107, No. 1108; and Strype refers to a manuscript in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, *De re Sacramentaria*, which he believes to have been compiled by Cranmer. In the State-Paper Office are also yet to be seen,

Lambeth Palace, and of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and in the State-Paper Office of the realm.

It is remarkable that Sanders, the Romish historian, who is so hostile to the memory of Cranmer, and has written [1] two treatises on Transubstantiation and the Eucharist, refers in neither of them, to the controversy we have witnessed, with his accustomed vituperation of the archbishop.

what he collected or indited, a paper, *De Sacramento Eucharistiæ;* another, *De Missa privata;* and in a thin folio (among discussions on other points) *De Eucharistia, De Sacramentorum usu,* and in English, *What a Sacrament is.* In the same repository, it may be added, are preserved *Articuli* BUCERI *de Eucharistia.*

[1] N. Sanderi, S. T. P. Orat. de Transubstantiatione, &c. Antverpiæ, 1566. De Eucharistia, &c. Antv. 1570.

CHAPTER XI.

1551 to 1552.

Alienation of lands belonging to the See of Winchester, after the deprivation of Gardiner—Such spoliations then frequent—Cranmer desirous to prevent them—Case of Hooper, bishop of Worcester—Deprivation of Tunstal, bishop of Durham—Cranmer's exertion in behalf of Tunstal—Cranmer's recommendation of Coverdale to be bishop of Exeter—Cranmer's care of Latimer—Latimer's employment at Lambeth—The lady Mary's refusal to conform to the new liturgy—The revision of that liturgy—The ill-health of Cranmer.

THE deprivation of Gardiner, like that of Bonner, [1] excited the murmurs of some who merely objected to arbitrary measures, and the louder censures of others who were friends to the Church of Rome. Nor did the promotion of the learned Ponet to the see of Winchester, vacated by Gardiner, tend to soften them. To the eyes of some distinguished courtiers, much of the property belonging to that see appeared desirable; and to them the new possessor was led to alienate it. In

[1] Burnet. Heylin.

the reign of Edward, ecclesiastical vacancies were often thus turned to the advantage of laymen in power; and it has been rightly considered as most [1] discreditable to the memory of the young sovereign's successive administrations, that such vacancies should have been so constantly used by the members of them, as opportunities of providing for themselves and their friends. When Hooper received, in addition to the see of Gloucester, that of Worcester, Heylin thinks that he was to enjoy only a short allowance from the wealth of the latter. "[2] The pirates of the court," the historian says, "were too intent on all advantages to let such a vessel pass untouched, in which they might both find enough to enrich themselves, and yet leave that which was sufficient to content the merchant." These causes of offence Cranmer is [3] believed to have been very desirous of removing, for indeed the possessions of his own see are [4] said to have then suffered more than in the [5] time of Henry.

The deprivation of another distinguished prelate was now meditated. Tunstal, bishop of Durham, the politest scholar of the age, as well as a man of exemplary moderation, still retaining his early attachment to the Church of Rome,

[1] Soames, Hist. Ref. iii. 611.
[2] Heylin, 101.
[3] Strype.
[4] H. Wharton, 101.
[5] See vol. i. 364.

although he concurred in some proceedings of the Reformers, was accused of being privy to a plot for exciting an insurrection in the North. The letter which he had received upon the subject, he had not only concealed from the government, but had answered; and his correspondent then turned his accuser. He was committed to the Tower. At the close of 1551, a bill was introduced into the house of lords, charging him with heinous offences, and proposing to deprive him of his bishopric. Cranmer rose and objected to the proceeding. No accusers appeared to substantiate the charge. Written depositions alone were produced; but the archbishop found himself mistaken, if he expected that Tunstal would obtain in the case of deprivation that indulgence, which in the case of treason was allowed by a recent public enactment; namely, [1] that no person should be arraigned, indicted, convicted, or attainted, of any manner of treason, unless on the oath of two lawful accusers, who should be brought before him at the time of his arraignment, and there should openly avow and maintain their

[1] Dr. Lingard, who gives the abstract of this law, eloquently observes, that "thus was laid the foundation of a most important improvement in the administration of justice; and a maxim was introduced, which has proved the best shield of innocence against the jealousy, the arts, and the vengeance of superior power." Hist. Eng. 8vo. vii. 122.

charges against him. The bill was passed by the lords: but Cranmer resolutely entered his protest against it, although supported in his dissent only by a [1] single peer, who was a zealous Roman Catholic. What the peers approved, however, the commons resisted. They voted, in the spirit of the new law, that, before the attainder was confirmed, the accusers and the accused should be heard face to face. Their resolution they submitted to the king, who returned no answer; and thus the bill proceeded no further. But afterwards a commission directed to the lord chief justice and others, instead of a public trial, effected what was desired; the commissioners being satisfied with written documents, and the prelate being accordingly by them deprived of his see before the end of 1552. In the reign of Mary he was restored to it, in that of Elizabeth again deprived of it, and ended his days, nominally as a prisoner at Lambeth Palace, in 1559.

In filling up the vacant sees in his province, the advice of Cranmer was generally followed. While the preceding transactions were leading to the removal of prelates, an opportunity offered of advancing, through his interest, to the episcopal rank, his unassuming friend, Miles Coverdale, dear to him as a man of learning, still more so as

[1] Lord Stourton. Journals of the H. of Lords.

a constant preacher of the Gospel, and an able [1] translator of the Scriptures. Coverdale had accompanied lord [2] Russel, in his expedition against the Devonshire rebels, as his chaplain. Veysey, bishop of Exeter, in 1551 resigned that see. A successor more fit than Coverdale could hardly be found; in the autumn of that year he was accordingly so consecrated. Scarcely two years had witnessed him a prelate, when Mary hurled him from his dignity, to which Elizabeth would gladly have restored him, if he had not preferred the acceptance of a parochial benefice. To him, as to Latimer, the quiet of a private life was infinitely more valuable than the wealth, with the cares, of a mitre. Like him, Latimer also might have again possessed the bishopric which he had [3] formerly resigned; but finding in Lambeth palace, where for many years he was the guest of Cranmer, the supply of all his wishes, he declined it, equally honoured, however, "[4] by all sorts of people, never losing the name of *lord*, and still looked on as a bishop, though without a bishopric." What wonder, when his principal employment there was to be of service to others, to be the almoner of the archbishop, and especially to procure redress for those who complained

[1] See his correspondence concerning the translations of the Bible, vol. i. p. 229, seq.

[2] See before, in the present vol. p. 72.

[3] See before, vol. i. p. 279.

[4] Heylin, 102.

of the law's delay or partiality. "Poor folks come unto me," so he told the king and the protector in one of his sermons, "desiring me that I will speak that their matters may be heard. I trouble my lord of Canterbury; and being in his house, now and then I walk in the garden looking in my book, as I can do but little good at it. But something I must needs do, to satisfy this place. I am no sooner in the garden, and have read awhile, but by and by cometh there some or other knocking at the gate. Anon cometh my man, and saith, Sir, there is one at the gate would speak with you. When I come there, then it is some or other that desireth me that I will speak that his matter might be heard, that he hath lain thus long at a great cost and charges, and cannot once have his matter come to the hearing." What suitor in the court of chancery, even in this our day, would not be glad of such an advocate before his sovereign?

The refusal of the lady Mary to conform to the new liturgy, and the connivance at her use of the mass, had now long continued. Her disobedience grieved the young king; and at the beginning of 1551 he sought the advice of Cranmer, Ridley, and Ponet, in order to suffer it no longer. They replied, that "[1] to give licence to sin, was sin; but to suffer and wink at it for a

[1] March 20, 1551. K. Edward's Journal. Burnet.

time might be borne, so all possible haste might be used;" which the biographer of bishop Ridley interprets, [1] that it was always a sin in a prince to give licence to sin, but not always so to forbear or remit the punishment for a time, in hopes of amendment; and that sometimes a less evil, connived at, might prevent a greater. In truth, from her kinsman, the emperor of Germany, Mary had obtained protection; and from Edward's Council Charles had obtained a promise in her favour. That promise was now said to have been only of a temporary connivance. After five months more, the king himself wrote to her, and she then answered him, "[2] that although your Majesty hath far more knowledge and greater gifts than others of your years, yet it is not possible that your Highness can at these years be a judge in matters of religion. And, therefore, I take it that the matter in your letter proceedeth from such as do wish those things to take place, which be most agreeable to themselves; by whose doings (your Majesty not offended) I intend not to rule my conscience." The Council, four days after the date of this epistle, informed her, in the king's name, of his sorrow "[3] to perceive no amendment in her, of that which for God's cause, her

[1] Ridley, 332.

[2] Foxe. And Council-Book, Archæol. vol. xviii. The letter is dated August 19, [1551.]

[3] Council-Book, Archæol. ut supr.

soul's health, and the common tranquillity of the realm, he had so long desired; assuring her that his sufferance had much more demonstration of natural love, than contentation of his conscience and foresight of his safety; that although she gave him great occasion to diminish his natural love, yet he was loth to feel it decay, and meant not to be so careless of her as he was provoked; and therefore he sent the lord chancellor Riche, Sir Anthony Wingfield, and Sir William Petre, to regulate her household." These commissioners proceeded to her residence in Essex. They reported to her the king's pleasure, that the Romish service must be discontinued in her house; and to her chaplains, and servants, the prohibition also was announced. By them, but not by her, obedience was now promised. Dr. Malet, who [1] formerly assisted Cranmer in a revision of the service-book to which Mary adhered, had already endured imprisonment for using the ancient ritual, in her absence, as her chaplain. Aware that the emperor had threatened to dissolve the friendship between England and his dominions, if the liberty of worship was still denied her, Mary, therefore, rather scornfully observed, that if her chaplains should say no mass, she could hear none; that they might do as they pleased; that still "[2] she would be the true subject and sister of

[1] See before, vol. i. p. 198.

[2] Council-Book, Archæol. ut supr.

the king, and would obey his commandments in all things, *except in these matters of religion touching the mass and the new service.*" No further communications ensued; and prudence or policy again submitted "to wink at" the violation of legitimate command.

The service, which the heir presumptive to the crown now scorned, was at this time passing through a revisal. Some exceptions had been taken at parts of it, which were thought not to be free from superstition. Calvin was one of the earliest objectors to the book. In a letter to the protector, late in 1549, he commenced his strictures upon it. In his correspondence afterwards with Bullinger, and with Cranmer, he disapproved not only of the book, but of the whole English Reformation. He had projected for this country a submission to his own code; and to this purpose he [1] employed agents in the court, the country, and the two Universities. Mosheim has accordingly assumed it as a fact, [2] that by the industrious zeal of the Genèvan reformer and his disciples, more especially Peter Martyr, the cause of Lutheranism in England lost ground considerably; and the Universities, schools, and churches became the oracles of Calvinism, which also acquired new votaries among the people

[1] Heylin, 107.

[2] Ecc. Hist. cent. xvi. sect. 16.

from day to day: Hence, he adds, it happened, that when it was proposed, under the reign of Edward, to give a fixed and stable form to the doctrine and discipline of the Church, Geneva was acknowledged as a sister Church; and the theological system, there established by Calvin, was adopted and rendered *the public rule of faith in England.*—Our national rule of faith, however, first formed almost wholly by Cranmer, little altered in the reign of Elizabeth, and from that time still maintained by us, is in its most material points opposed to the Calvinistic system. But of this hereafter; for the completion of Edward's second liturgy preceded the publication of the articles of religion; and that liturgy is now before us.

In the convocation of 1550 some doubts, excited perhaps by the reflections of Calvin and his party, certainly [1] appear to have been expressed relating to passages and rubrics in the first service-book; and to have occasioned in the upper house, among the prelates, debates upon the points; in the lower, among the inferior clergy, the promise of their consideration of them. In the acts of that convocation [2] thus much has been left on record; and in the course of that year a review of the book was determined. Cranmer, solicitous to obtain every help to the completion of it, re-

[1] Heylin, 107. [2] Ibid.

quired, after the [1] resolution of altering several points had passed, the written opinions of those distinguished foreigners, with whom he had perhaps before [2] conversed upon the subject, Bucer and Peter Martyr. Bucer delivered what he thought in a [3] treatise consisting of no less than twenty-eight chapters; and communicated it, first, to Martyr. In all the animadversions, Martyr acknowledged his concurrence; informing him, at the same time, that the archbishop had told him of the conclusion of our own divines to make many alterations in the book, but [4] what they were he neither knew, nor dared of Cranmer to inquire. Bucer admitted, in his prefatory address to Cranmer, that he had found *nothing in the book, which, if fairly considered, was repugnant to the Word of God and to the practice of the ancient Churches.* In the act of parliament that confirmed its revisal, the same character of it is given, with the addition, "that such doubts, as had been raised in the use and exercise of it, proceeded rather from the curiosity of the minister and mistakers, than of any other worthy cause;" that therefore "it was found expedient, that the said book should be

[1] Martyr to Bucer. See the letter, Strype, Append. No. 61.

[2] See before, p. 212.

[3] See his Scripta Anglicana. A comparison of his remarks with the first and second liturgies will shew how far they might have contributed to the revision.

[4] Martyr to Bucer, ut supr.

faithfully perused, explained, and made fully perfect in all such places, in which it was necessary to be made more earnest and fit for the stirring up of all Christian people to the true honouring of Almighty God." To this completion the observations of Bucer, and consequently of Martyr, were certainly in some parts auxiliary, but also in some ineffectual; the exception being not always well-grounded, and the proffered substitution not always well-chosen. The cool judgment of Cranmer, and Ridley, and Cox, who were [1] among the reviewers of the book, could not be mistaken in what they received, or declined, from these helpers of their task.

Yet to foreigners principally it might be thought that we have been indebted for the amendments, and that the English clergy were induced to an admission rather than to a share in the formation of them by a royal threat, when we read the following passage in the recent history of our

[1] Strype, Ecc. Mem. ii. 366. "In October, 1552, Cox wrote to Bullinger, that they had already altered the rites of the public prayers, and framed them according to the rules of God's Word; and had intended a restoration of ecclesiastical discipline." Dr. Cox was one of the committee who formed the Order for the Communion, and also the first Liturgy. He was at this time almoner to the king, and in the reign of Elizabeth, bishop of Ely. The other persons, engaged in the review of the book, are supposed to be the same who first compiled it. Ridley, 334. See before, in the present vol. p. 64.

country. "It was about three years," says the historian, with an apparent sneer, "since the composition of the Book of Common Prayer had been attributed by the unanimous assent of the legislature to [1] *the aid of the Holy Ghost.* But this solemn declaration had not convinced the scepticism of the foreign teachers. They examined the book with a jealous eye; they detected passages, which in their estimation savoured of superstition, or led to idolatry; their complaints were echoed and re-echoed by their English disciples; and Edward, at the suggestion of his favourite instructors, affirmed that, [2] if the prelates did not undertake the task, the new service should be freed from these blemishes without their assistance. Cranmer submitted the book in a Latin translation to the consideration of Bucer and Peter Martyr, whose judgment or prejudice recommended several omissions, and explanations, and improvements; a committee of bishops and divines acquiesced in most of the animadversions of these foreign teachers; and the book in its amended form received the assent of the convocation."

Nearly two years had elapsed after the death of

[1] See before, in the present volume, what is said of this expression, p. 66.

[2] Martyr says, that Sir John Cheke *told* him this. Martyr to Bucer, Epist. Strype, Append. No. 61. Some writers have incorrectly stated the archbishop as the reporter of the royal threat.

Bucer, before the revised liturgy appeared. So determined was Cranmer to proceed, in his usual manner, gradually and with moderation; notwithstanding the alleged impatience of the sovereign, and the pretended echoes of it by his subjects. In the month of August, 1552, this second service-book, which is very near the same with that we now use, was [1] finished at the press; but the printer, in the following month, was directed [2] not to publish it till some corrections, and an addition concerning the posture of kneeling at the communion were made. Late in October, the [3] Council ordered this addition; and on the first of November the service came into general use, not without especial solemnity in the metropolis. Ridley, in the morning of that day, read it in his cathedral, and preached, without the embroidered cope or vestment, in his rochet only; and, in the afternoon, again preached at [4] Paul's Cross, when

[1] Herbert.

[2] Strype, Ecc. Mem. ii. 366.

[3] Burnet. Strype.

[4] Paul's Cross was a pulpit cross of timber, mounted upon steps of stone, and covered with lead, in which were sermons preached by eminent divines, and around which were covered galleries for the reception of distinguished auditors, other persons standing exposed to the open air. It was a place also of general resort, proclamations and other public matters being there notified. Jane Shore there did penance. The rood of grace was there exposed, and broken to pieces. See before, vol. i. p. 247. It has been said by Shepherd, Introduct. to the

" [1] the lord mayor, aldermen, and crafts, in their best liveries were present, and the sermon tended to the setting forth the late-made Book of Common Prayer, which continued till almost five of the clock at night; so that the mayor, aldermen, and companies entered not into St. Paul's Church, as had been accustomed, but departed home by torch-light."

Ridley, in his rochet only, was conforming to a new rubric in the amended service-book respecting the ministerial dress. A bishop was to be so habited in his ministration of divine offices; the inferior clergy, without alb, cope, or vestment, in a surplice. In agreement with Bucer, another rubric directed the service to be sung or said in such part of the church or chancel, as the people might best hear; and the minister was so to turn himself, as he might be heard most conveniently by the people. In opposition to this Reformer, who loudly censured the separation of the chancel from the church, the rubric that in the former book respected the chancels was confirmed by an addition, that they should remain as they had done in times past. Another rubric enjoined the

Elucidation of the Common Prayer, that the last sermon there preached was in Lent, 1620. Mr. Zouch, in his notes on Walton's Lives, mentions a drawing of it, in the library of Magdalen College, in Cambridge, as it appeared in 1621.

[1] Stow, 1028.

[1] table to be placed in the body of the church or in the chancel, but altar-wise, that is, north and south, the minister being directed to stand at the north side of it. In some churches it had been placed east and west. To the communion office was added the rubric, which explained, that, by the posture of kneeling at the time of receiving the sacrament, no adoration was intended "either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood;" a copy from Cranmer's own treatise upon the subject. The mixing of water with wine in the celebration of the sacrament; the use of oil in baptism, and of the cross in confirmation; the unction of the sick, and the prayers for the dead; were also no longer retained.

The service itself [2] now commenced with a selection of sentences from the Scripture, and with the minister's exhortation to his auditors of confession to God and self-examination: The general confession and absolution followed. These were also adapted to private use in the Primer, which, at the [3] beginning of Edward's reign, having been enjoined "to be taught, learned, and read, and none other to be used throughout all his dominions,"

[1] See before, p. 236.

[2] Differently from the first service. See before, p. 67.

[3] Printed by Grafton, in November, 1547. See before, p. 43.

had since that time received important alterations, containing devotions "[1] agreeable and according to the Book of Common Prayers;" [2] uniformity even of daily private prayer being now publicly directed as requisite; and the sentences were thus commended to the supplicant. "At the beginning of morning and evening private prayer, thou shalt daily read, meditate, weigh, and deeply consider out of these sentences of Holy Scripture that follow; and then from the bottom of thine heart add the confession of thy sins, and the prayer following," which is no other than our conditional form of absolution. Thus "the Dirige, or An Office in times of mourning," consists, in the little volume, chiefly of sublime as well as pathetic orisons, which are in our impressive funeral service, and in our formulary for visiting the sick. The two prayers for the king, which are now in the communion service, are also found in this Primer.

To the communion service in the revised liturgy, were now prefixed the Lord's Prayer and the collect for purity; followed by the Ten Commandments with the petition annexed to each of them. This introduction of the decalogue into the service, has been considered by Wheatly, and others, as peculiar to the English Church. But it

[1] So expressed in the licence to the printer, dated in March 1553. Strype.

[2] Preamble to the edition of 1553. Ecc. Mem. ii. 378.

is [1] found in the Strasburg liturgy of 1551. The placing of it afterwards, together with the Apostles' Creed, over the altar, has been also [2] thought an Anglican religious peculiarity. The former introduction was chosen to remind the people, that as the Divine precepts of the moral law were as obligatory upon Christians as upon the Jews, they should for past offences against them implore pardon, and grace in future to observe them. The latter was [3] intended as a symbolical representation of the doctrine, which should be exhibited always before the eyes of the people, that good works as well as faith are the conditions of salvation, the Ten Commandments representing the former, and the Creed the latter.

The Athanasian Creed was now directed to be read upon more days, than had been prescribed in the first service-book. The age, which brought on the Reformation, was suspected of Arianism. This form of faith especially asserts the doctrine of the Trinity, as maintained in the two first general councils against Arius and Macedonius; and of the Incarnation, as explained in the two following councils against Nestorius and Eutyches. Cranmer, therefore, judged the more frequent repetition of this ancient formulary to be necessary, as a caution against the anti-trinitarian

[1] Strype, Ecc. Mem. ii. 242.

[2] Dean Tucker, Letters to Dr. Kippis, p. 101.

[3] Ibid.

notions not only of those already mentioned, but against the heresies also of Sabellius, who confounded the three persons in the Godhead, and of Apollinarius, who denied that Christ was a perfect man.

The singing of psalms or hymns was sanctioned by the [1] Act that confirmed the first liturgy. In the interval, before the revision, the practice seems to have become popular, I mean the plain congregational singing in parish churches of psalms in metre, as distinguished from the choral service in cathedrals and collegiate chapels, which was of the prosaic, but infinitely more solemn, form. Cranmer appears to have paid attention, [2] long before, to the subject of religious song. The translation of the psalms into French rhymes by Clement Marot, groom of the bed-chamber to Francis the First, was now well known in England. The translator, too, was a friend to the Reformation. His psalms had been also introduced by Calvin into his congregation at Geneva, after having been in France sung by the king and his courtiers upon ordinary occasions, not in churches, to some [3] favourite or fashionable tune. Him it

[1] See before, in the present vol. p. 68.

[2] See vol. i. p. 356.

[3] "The dauphin prince Henry, who delighted in hunting, was fond of *Ainsi qu' on oit le cerf bruire*, or, *Like as the hart desireth the water-brooks*, which he constantly sung in going out to the chace. Madame de Valentinois, between whom and

had been the object of Sternhold, groom of the robes to the English sovereign, to imitate; hoping that the courtiers here would sing his versions, instead of their own sonnets; "[1] but," says Anthony Wood, "they did not, only some few excepted." A [2] second edition of his psalms, however, with a few more by his coadjutor Hopkins, was published in 1551; and in the following year a third; a sign that they were very acceptable, when the liturgy was reviewed, to the common people, and that, like Luther and Calvin, the reviewers considered such labours as useful in familiarizing Scriptural information.

As of the first liturgy there had been a French translation for the use of our sovereign's subjects at [3] Calais and its dependencies, so now of the second a version was made by a learned French divine. This employment had been [4] sought by

the young prince there was an attachment, took *Du fond de ma pensée*, or, *From the depth of my heart, O Lord.* The queen's favourite was, *Ne vueilles pas, O Sire*, that is, *O Lord, rebuke me not*, which she sung to a fashionable jig. Anthony, king of Navarre sung, *Revenge moy, pren le querelle*, or, *Stand up, O Lord, to revenge my quarrel*, to the air of a dance of Poitou." Warton, Hist. of Eng. Poetry, sect. 45.

[1] Ath. Ox. i. 76.

[2] The first edition consisted of thirty-seven psalms, and was published in 1549. The version of *all the psalms*, by Sternhold and his friends, appeared not till the year 1562.

[3] Belonging to Cranmer's diocese. See vol. i. p. 174.

[4] Strype.

others, who proposed to print it, for the use of the isles of Jersey and Guernsey. The secretary Cecil was entreated to procure a royal licence to this purpose. He communicated the request to Cranmer, who returned the following answer.

" [1] After my very hearty commendations, I thank you for your news, but specially for that you advertise me that the king's Majesty is in good health, wherein I beseech God long to continue his Highness, as He hath twice, as I trust, restored me to the same.

" It seemeth by your letters, that a [2] peace should be concluded betwixt the emperor and duke Maurice, which, whether it be according to the articles that afore you sent unto me, or otherwise, I would gladly understand.

" The commodity that might arise by printing the Book of Common Prayer and Administration

[1] Strype, Append. No. 106.

[2] " The memorable treaty of Passau, that overturned the vast fabric, in erecting which Charles had employed so many years, and had exerted the utmost efforts of his power and policy; that annulled all his regulations with regard to religion, defeated all his hopes of rendering the imperial authority absolute and hereditary in his family, and *established the Protestant Church*, which had hitherto subsisted precariously in Germany, through connivance, or by expedients, *upon a firm and secure basis*. Maurice reaped all the glory of having concerted and completed this unexpected revolution." Robertson, Charles V. This treaty of peace was signed, Aug. 2, 1552. The conditions varied little from former propositions made by Maurice.

of the Sacraments in the French tongue, if any be, I reckon it were meet that it should come to them who have already taken pains in translating the same; which was first done by [1] Sir Hugh Paulet's commandment, and overseen by my lord chancellor and others at his appointment; and now altered according to that which must be put in execution at the [2] feast of All Saints next, at the appointment of my lord chancellor, by a learned Frenchman, a doctor in divinity; and therefore needless of any other to be travailed in. Aug. 26, 1552."

A Greek and Latin version of the Common Prayer, it may be added, appeared in 1553

In the preceding letter the archbishop speaks of recovery from two fits of illness. One of these is described in a [3] letter to Cecil, dated the day only before the last, in which he recommends to the secretary's consideration four eminent divines as fit to adorn the Irish prelacy. He then entreats Cecil to inform Sir John Cheke, the friend of both, that "a quotidian, or double tertian ague (his physicians not determining which it was) had left him two days, but that, if it returned that night, it would probably become a quartan; yet, that, however it might be, his greatest grief was that he could not proceed, as he desired, in such matters as he had in hand, this *terrenum domici-*

[1] Governor of Calais.

[2] The first day appointed for the use of the second liturgy. See before, p. 272.

[3] Strype, Append. No. 65.

lium being such an obstacle to all good purposes." In this letter he also wisely stated how the Protestant preacher might benefit Ireland. One of those, whom he now recommended to fill the see of Armagh, hesitated to accept it, because his preaching, he had said, to persons who understood not the English language, would be useless. "True," Cranmer observes to Cecil, "but if they do not, then I say, that if he will take the pains *to learn the Irish tongue*—then both his person and doctrine shall be more acceptable not only unto his diocese, but also throughout all [1] Ireland."

In the preceding year too the archbishop had been disordered in his health, as John à Lasco [2] informed his friend Albert Hardenberg. At that time he was resident in his palace at Croydon, when an earthquake threw all the books from their shelves, and broke all the windows, in it, without further injury; while in the town some houses fell. Of another malady he had been in danger, the sweating sickness (as it was called) being in the autumn of the same year prevalent, and à Lasco and his wife, who were then his visitors at Croydon, being both attacked by it.

[1] Among the Carew MSS. in Lambeth Library, (No. 602.) there are several curious letters addressed to Cranmer's friend Cromwell, respecting the civil affairs of *Ireland*, and one from the archbishop of Dublin concerning its ecclesiastical state.

[2] Epist. Joh. à Lasco, Maji. 31, 1551. Gerdesii Miscell. ii. 676—679.

CHAPTER XII.

1552.

Designs against church property—Cecil cautions Cranmer on the subject—Cranmer defends himself against the implication of being rich, in answer to Cecil—Hints to the Master of Jesus College, Cambridge, also his lack of wealth—The forty-two Articles of Religion—The Catechism accompanying them—The Articles not Calvinistic.

WHILE the young sovereign was making an excursion, and the archbishop was resident at Croydon, in the summer of 1552, the enemies of the latter are believed to have been active in malicious designs, both against himself and others of his order. The prelates, it was pretended, were extremely rich, avaricious, inhospitable, careful only for themselves and their posterity. To these reports the secretary Cecil had listened. Of church property himself had [1] already received some grants. Others, more greedy perhaps of ecclesias-

[1] Henry Wharton charges Cecil with very rapacious proceedings of this kind in the reign of Elizabeth. Notes on Strype's Life of Cranmer, folio edit. p. 261. Against such charges Dr. Nares, in his extensive and truly valuable Memoirs of him, defends this great statesman. Vol. i. 384.

tical prey, he knew. He affected, therefore, to caution the archbishop in the words of St. Paul, *that they, who will be rich, fall into temptation and a snare.* Cranmer, in the following answer to him, invalidated the reports, not without glancing at the plunder that had already been allowed.

" [1] After my most hearty commendations and thanks as well for your [2] genteel letters, as for the [3] Pacification, and for your good remembrance of the two matters which I desired you not to forget, the one concerning the [4] bishop of Cologne's letters, and the other [5] Mr. Mowse; for whom eftsoons I give you my most hearty thanks.

" As for your *admonition,* I take it most thankfully, as I have ever been most glad to be admonished by my friends, accounting no man so foolish as he that will not hear friendly admonishments. But as for the saying of St. Paul, *Qui volunt ditescere, incidunt in tentationem,* I fear it not half so much as I do stark beggary. For I took not half so much care for my living, when I was a scholar of Cambridge, as I do at this pre-

[1] Strype, Append. No. 67. [2] See before, vol. i. p. 250.

[3] The conditions offered to Maurice by the emperor Charles, and accepted. See before, p. 279.

[4] Herman. See before, p. 180.

[5] Master of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, in 1552, a man of learning, but not of steady religious principles. Strype, Life of Cranm. B. 3. ch. 23.

sent. For although I have now much more revenue, yet I have much more to do withal; and have more care to live now as an archbishop, than I had at that time to live like a scholar. I have not so much as I had within ten years past by one hundred and fifty pounds of certain rent, beside casualties. I pay double for every thing that I buy. If a good auditor have this account, he shall find no great surplusage to wax rich upon. And if I knew any bishop that was covetous, I would surely admonish him; but I know none but all beggars, except it be [1] one, and yet I [2] dare well say, he is not very rich. If you know any, I beseech you to advertise me, for peradventure I may advise him better than you.

"To be short, I am not so doted to set my mind upon things here, which neither I can carry away with me, nor tarry long with them. If time would have served, I would have written of

[1] Strype thinks this *one* to have been Holgate, archbishop of York. His riches are said to have been seized by Mary, and himself to have been committed in her reign to the Tower. He still possessed, however, sufficient wealth to endow three free-schools: one at York, one at Old Malton, and another at Hemsworth, in the county of York. He died in retirement in 1556. Drake's York, 453.

[2] Cranmer knew of the numerous estates which Holgate had been forced to surrender, as he himself had been of many that belonged to the see of Canterbury to Henry. Strype gives a list of those transferred by Cranmer, Drake of those by Holgate.

other things unto you; but your servant making haste compelleth me here to cut the thread, beseeching Almighty God to preserve the king's Majesty with all his Council and family, and send him well to return from his progress. From my Manor of Croydon, the xxi. of July, [1552.]

"Your own ever,

"T. CANTUAR."

It was probably in the preceding month of this year, that to the master of the college in which he had been educated he acknowledges with pleasantry, what to Cecil he explains with spirit, his lack of wealth. We have [1] before repeatedly witnessed him in pecuniary difficulty. He scruples not again thus to confess it.

"[2] In my right hearty wise I commend me unto you, and so certify you that I send you here a buck to be bestowed among your company within your college. And forasmuch as you have more store of money, and also less need, than I at this season; therefore I bequeath a noble of your purse towards the baking and seasoning of him. And whensoever I have so much money before hand, as I am now behind hand, I shall repay you your noble again. And thus fare you well.

[1] See vol. i. pp. 99, 148. [2] Harl. MSS. No. 6148.

From my Manor of Croydon, the xxvj. day of June."

The design of Cranmer to promote uniformity among the clergy had now been deliberately carried on; and to this purpose were framed the forty-two Articles of Religion. In the month of [1] May, 1552, the first copy of them was laid before the Privy Council, by whom, in the preceding year, Cranmer was empowered to compose the formulary. We have before noticed him intent upon such a plan. It has been said, that "when interrogated on this very point by his relentless persecutors, not long before his death, he [2] unequivocally avowed himself to have been the author of these articles. It has nevertheless been usually conceived, that he derived much assistance from Ridley, who, as far as the paucity of his writings enables us to judge, seems to have no less excelled in perspicuity than in solidity of argument, in manliness of conception than in energy of expression. Latimer likewise has been

[1] Strype.

[2] Laurence, Serm. p. 29, and notes, p. 215, where Foxe's authority is cited, "As for the Catechism, the book of Articles, with the other book against Winchester, &c. he (Cranmer) granted the same to be his doings." Cranmer's own words, however, are "Quoad Catechismum et Articulos in eodem fatetur se adhibuisse ejus consilium circa editionem ejusdem." Proc. MSS. Lambeth, No. 1136.

considered as his coadjutor in the same undertaking. That each of these respectable bishops was consulted on the occason appears highly probable. Ridley, if an anecdote [1] recorded of him be accurate, expressly stated, that he both perused the production before its publication, and noted many things for it; that he thus consented to it, but that he was not the author of it. The venerable Latimer, who had resigned his bishopric in the reign of Henry, declining a reinstatement in it, then dwelt under the roof of the archbishop, by whom, for his virtues and integrity, he was sincerely respected and cordially beloved. To a divine of this description, so peculiarly circumstanced, it is impossible to suppose a design of such importance not to have been communicated; to one who had acquired the proud title of the apostle of England, who had long been the primate's fellow-labourer in the work of reformation, and who was capable not only of improving it by his wisdom and experience, but of conferring upon it an old man's benediction. But although we allow this, and even more than this; although we admit, that Cranmer held in the highest esteem the masculine mind of Ridley, and the plain but strong sense as well as unshaken probity of Latimer; men, who bore able testimony to the truth, while in prosperity, and in adversity sealed it with their

[1] By Foxe.

blood; yet it appears not that, from any consciousness of personal inferiority, he ever beheld them with an obsequious eye. He indeed ought alone to be considered as the real and ostensible author of the production; although collecting the sentiments of others, yet in all cases exercising the privilege of accepting or rejecting what may have been offered to him at pleasure, and regulating his decisions by a judgment, to which all with submission bowed; which, matured by the most extensive reading, and formed upon the purest principles, his adversaries respected and his friends revered."

To [1] other prelates, besides Ridley and Latimer; to the six royal chaplains, [2] Harley, Bill, Horn, Grindal, Perne, and Knox; to his fellow-labourer in various transactions to promote the Reformation, Dr. Cox; and to the distinguished laymen, Cecil and Sir John Cheke; the Articles were indeed submitted. The wish to be guided by the judgment of others, was the result of that modest opinion which Cranmer constantly entertained of his own, however excellent it was. After the Articles had been first shewn to Cecil and to Cheke, and had been returned with some remarks, he in the month of September amended the com-

[1] Strype.

[2] Ibid. A copy of the Articles in Latin, with copies of their names subscribed, is now in the State-Paper Office.

pilation, but still earnestly entreated the further consideration of both the learned courtiers. "[1] I have sent," he writes to Cecil, "the book of Articles for Religion unto Mr. Cheke, set in a better order than it was, and the titles upon every matter, adding thereto that which lacked. I pray you, consider well the Articles with Mr. Cheke; and, whether you think best to move the king's Majesty therein before my coming, I refer that unto your two wisdoms."

The Articles were immediately laid before the king; at the beginning of the next month the royal chaplains, already mentioned, were required to overlook them; and the Privy Council, a few weeks afterwards, dispatched the book to the archbishop, for "the last corrections of his judgment and his pen," at his residence in Kent, whence he returned it to them with the following letter.

"[2] After my very humble recommendations unto your good lordships, I have sent unto the same the book of Articles, which yesterday I received from your lordships. I have sent also a cedule enclosed, declaring briefly my mind upon the said book; beseeching your lordships to be means unto the king's Majesty, that all the bishops may have authority from him to cause all their

[1] Strype, Append. No. 66.

[2] Ibid. No. 67.

preachers, archdeacons, deans, prebendaries, parsons, vicars, curates, with all their clergy, to subscribe the said Articles. And then I trust, that such a concord and quietness in religion shall shortly follow thereof, as else is not to be looked for, many years. God shall thereby be glorified, His truth shall be advanced, and your lordships shall be rewarded of Him as the setters forward of His true Word and Gospel. Unto whom is my daily prayer, without ceasing, to preserve the king's Majesty, with all your honourable lordships. From my house at Ford, the xxiv. of this present month of November, [1552.]

"Your lordships' ever to command,

"T. CANTUAR."

The mandate of the king, to cause the required subscription, was issued not many days before his death. What occasioned this delay of publication more than six months, after the examination which the Articles thus had undergone, and after the last corrections of the principal composer's pen, it is impossible now to affirm. But it is probable they were, in that interval, submitted to the two houses of convocation, and that out of both a committee was [1] chosen who might assent

[1] As the preface to the Latin edition of the Articles seems to imply. Dr. Nares, Mem. of Lord Burghley, i. 369.

to them in the name of the whole. Burnet [1] contends that they were not thus offered alike to the prelates and the inferior clergy; but admits the probability of their having been brought into the upper house only.

The first impression of the Articles, it has been [2] said, presented a Catechism before them. It is true that such an edition of the Articles was published. But the king's printer published them separately, and with a title in spirit indeed, but not in the letter, agreeing with that which Burnet asserts to be the first appearance of them. It was as follows: "Articles agreed on by the bishops and other learned men in the synod at London, in the year of our Lord God, 1552, *for the avoiding of controversy in opinions, and the establishment of a godly concord in certain matters of religion.* Published by the king's Majesty's commandment in the month of May, 1553. Rich. Graftonus, typographus regius excudebat. Lond. mense Junii, 1553." The copy to which Burnet alludes, coupled with the Catechism, was thus entitled: "A [3] short Catechism, or plain instruction, containing the sum of Christian learning, set forth by the king's Majesty's authority, for all school-

[1] Hist. Ref. iii. ann. 1552. [2] By Burnet, ibid.

[3] So the Catechism of 1548 was entitled a *short* instruction; but in size it far surpassed the present, amounting to not less than 500 pages.

masters to teach. To this Catechism are adjoined the Articles agreed upon by the bishops, and other learned and godly men, in the last convocation at London, in 1552, *for to root out the discord of opinions, and stablish the agreement of true religion.* Likewise published by the king's authority, 1553. Imprinted by John Day." Prefixed to it is the royal injunction to all schoolmasters, and teachers of youth, dated May 20, 1553, truly and diligently to teach this Catechism in their schools, immediately after *the other brief Catechism,* which had been already set forth. The same publication in Latin issued from the press, at the same time, of [1] Reynold Wolfe. "We committed the debating and diligent examination of it," the king in his injunction says, "to certain bishops and other learned men, whose judgment we have in great estimation. And because it seemed agreeable with the Scriptures, and the ordinances of our realm, We have commanded it to be published." This implies that the Catechism, like the Articles, had been sanctioned by a committee.

To Cranmer the royal mandate was directed for the circulation of the Articles, in order to their being subscribed. Before their admission to

[1] Wolfe had a privilege for printing all Latin books. Cranmer appears to have written to Cecil upon this subject. Strype, Life of Cranm. Append. No. 66.

any benefice or cure, the clergy in every diocese; and before their admission to degrees in divinity as well as to the highest in arts, the members in both Universities; were required thus to give their assent. Burnet notices the letter of the Cambridge visitors to this purpose, but refrains to mention their assertion in it of the Articles having been agreed upon in the synod, so anxious he seems to maintain that "[1] by a variety of evidences it appears that these Articles were not passed in convocation, *nor so much as offered to it*;" forgetting his former opinion, that to the upper house they had been submitted. He had asserted thus much in a publication also, previous to the third volume of his History of the Reformation. The freethinker Collins eagerly availed himself of such authority, and said "[2] that although by several of our ecclesiastical writers, and by the title of the first book of Articles, those Articles are constantly attributed to the synod of 1552, they never passed that synod, but were an imposition of some of the clergy and others of those times upon it." The charge was thus immediately answered by one whom Burnet might, at least, have condescended to notice, when he

[1] Burnet, Hist. Ref. iii. ut supr.

[2] In his tract, entitled Priestcraft in perfection, relating to the 20th Article of the Ch. of Eng. 1710, p. 29.

repeated his synodical incredulity. "[1] The pretence of Collins," says Edmund Chishull, "is as false as it is frivolous. For this book of Articles, being first framed by archbishop Cranmer, was by him communicated to the king, to certain bishops, and other learned persons of that age; after which, it was brought into the synod then sitting, and there agreed to, and subscribed by the hands of the clergy. Of which latter circumstance there happens to be a clear though accidental proof, in that the subscription of 1552 was soon after objected on one side, and acknowledged on the other, by some of that very clergy, as had been shewn from a [2] printed controversy of that time."

The Articles thus seem to have been introduced, not indeed for the discussion, but only for the subscription, of the members, into the convocation. The enemies of Cranmer, in their final proceedings against him, accused him of having compelled many against their wills to subscribe them. "I exhorted such as were willing to subscribe," he replied; "but against their wills I compelled none." The terms, upon which sub-

[1] Sermon by E. Chishull, B.D. entitled The Orthodoxy of an English Clergyman, preached at an archidiaconal visitation, and published in 1711, p. 14. Chishull is well known, both as an eastern traveller, and a very learned divine.

[2] See the Bishop of Lincoln's (Wake) State of the Church and Clergy, p. 599. And the close of this chapter.

scription was required, are contained in the instructions of the king to [1] Thirlby, bishop of Norwich, and to [2] Ridley, bishop of London: "We will and exhort, that when and as often as you shall have any manner of person presented unto you to be admitted by you, as the ordinary, to any ecclesiastical order, ministry, office, or cure, within your diocese, that you shall, before you admit him, confer with him in every [of] these Articles; and, finding him thereto consenting, to cause him to subscribe the same in one ledger-book, to be formed for that purpose, which may remain as a register for a record, and to let him have a copy of the same Articles. And if any man in that case shall refuse to consent to any of the said Articles, and to subscribe the same, then We will and command you, that neither you, nor any of you, or by your procuracy in any wise, shall admit him, or allow him as sufficient and meet to take any order, ministry, or ecclesiastical cure. For which your so doing We shall discharge you from all manner of penalties, or dangers of actions, suits, or pleas of *premunire, quare impedit,* or such like. And yet our meaning is, if any party refuse to subscribe any of these Articles, for lack of learning and knowledge of the truth, you shall in that case by teaching, conference, and proof of the same by the Scriptures,

[1] Burnet. [2] Strype.

reasonably and discreetly move and persuade him thereto, before you shall peremptorily judge him as unable and recusant. And for the trial of his conformity you shall, according to your discretion, prefix a time and space convenient to deliberate, and give his consent, so that it be betwixt three weeks and six weeks from the time of his first access unto you. And if after six weeks he will not consent and agree willingly to subscribe, then you may, and lawfully shall, in any wise refuse to admit or enable him."

The observance of the Catechism was at the same time thus directed. "And where there is of late set forth by our authority a Catechism for the instruction of young scholars in the fear of God, and the true knowledge of His holy religion, with express commandment from us to all schoolmasters to teach and instruct their scholars the said Catechism, making it the beginning and first foundation of their teaching in their schools; our pleasure is, that, for the better execution of our said commandment, you shall yearly at the least once visit, or cause to be visited, every school within your said diocese, in which visitation it shall be inquired both how the schoolmaster of every such school hath used himself in the teaching of the said Catechism, and also how the scholars do receive and follow the same; making plain and full certificate of the offenders contrary to this our order, and of their several offences, to the arch-

bishop of the province within three months, from time to time, after every such offence."

Upon these formularies, now circulated sometimes in conjunction, as upon the earlier productions of his fellow-reformers, Ridley, not long before he was led from prison to the stake, thus bestowed his commendation, cheering his last hours with the recollection of his share in framing them. "[1] This Church of England had of late, through the infinite goodness and abundant grace of Almighty God, great substance, great riches of heavenly treasure, great plenty of God's true and sincere Word, the true and wholesome administration of Christ's holy sacraments, the whole profession of Christ's religion truly and plainly set forth in baptism, the plain declaration and understanding of the same taught in the holy *Catechism* to have been learned of all true Christians. The Church had also *a true and sincere form and manner of the Lord's Supper,* wherein according to Jesus Christ's own ordinance and holy institution, Christ's commandments were executed and done. For upon the bread and wine, set upon the Lord's table, thanks were given, the commemoration of Christ's death was had, the remembrance of Christ's body torn upon the cross was broken, and the cup in the remembrance of Christ's blood shed was distributed, and both communicated unto all that were present and would

[1] Foxe.

receive them; and also they were exhorted of the minister so to do. *All was openly done in the vulgar tongue,* so that every thing might be most easily heard, and plainly understood, of all the people, to God's high glory and the edification of the whole Church. This Church had of late *the whole divine service,* all common and public prayers ordained to be said and heard in the common congregation, not only framed and fashioned to the true vein of holy Scripture, but also set forth according to the commandment of the Lord, and St. Paul's doctrine for the people's edification *in their vulgar tongue.* It had also holy and wholesome *homilies* in commendation of the principal virtues which are commended in Scripture, and likewise other homilies against the most pernicious and capital vices that use, alas, to reign in this realm of England. This Church had, in matters of controversy, *Articles* so penned and framed after the holy Scripture, and grounded upon the true understanding of God's Word, that in short time, if they had been universally received, they should have been able to have set in Christ's Church much concord and unity in Christ's true religion, and to have expelled many false errors, and heresies, wherewith this Church, alas, was almost overgone."

It has been asserted in a recent history of our Church, that this Catechism of 1553 was enjoined to be taught in schools, *as a sequel to the other*

brief Catechism set forth in the beginning of Edward's reign; and the translation of the German formulary, usually called the first Catechism of king Edward, is represented as that to which the present was to be, as it were, the succeeding part. But the translated Catechism is, in the first place, not a brief but an [1] extensive statement of Lutheran doctrines, from some of which the Church of England now expressly dissented. Instructions that must clash, would therefore certainly not be enjoined. But a prefix to the present Catechism, in the next place, plainly shews what was intended. It is the king's injunction, which commands all masters of schools "truly and diligently to teach the same, after the other brief Catechism already set forth," which in the royal letters patent that follow, is called "*the little Catechism*," and which undoubtedly is no other than what had been placed in the service book, and was now declared a preparative for understanding the new form of instruction. Like the *little* Catechism, the *present* accordingly is in question and answer, not as the first formulary in this reign, which consists merely of treatises, or expositions, and directions. In this new dialogue the [2] Ten Commandments are first explained. The Creed is then illustrated.

[1] See an account of it in the present vol. chap. iii.

[2] As in the small German Catechisms of that time. See Biblioth. Symb. Evang. Lutheranæ, Gottingæ, 1752, pp. 376, 377.

The sacraments are next accounted only two, Baptism and the Lord's Supper; not, as in the Catechism of 1548, with the addition of The power of the keys; and the Lord's Prayer is paraphrased. Of this Catechism I have already stated the opinion most prevalent, that bishop [1] Ponet was the author. Now because this prelate had written a work in defence of the marriage of priests, a learned writer of the Church of Rome has disgraced his pages in bestowing, for no other reason, upon this plain and excellent instruction, the virulent name of "[2] Ponet's wanton Catechism."

From such kind of abuse the first Articles of our Religion have escaped; although misrepresentation has not scrupled to assail as well their doctrine as their history. Hence, as they differ very little from our present Thirty-nine Articles, the charges which have been often brought against the latter by some of the sons, as well as the foes, of the Church of England, are applied to these; in particular, that they are Calvinistical. It seems a novelty in our ecclesiastical annals, however,

[1] See before, in the present vol. p. 61. Ames, in his Hist. of Printing, mentions it, however, as assigned also to Becon, one of Cranmer's chaplains. Others name Nowell as the author. There is a Catechism of the former, little known; those of the latter are well known. Erasmus, Luther, Melancthon, Brentius, Calvin, and others, wrote Catechisms.

[2] Stapleton, Fortress of the Faith, &c. Antwerp, 1565, fol. 115. b.

that by Calvin they had been inspected in their earliest shape. "[1] The testimony of Calvin himself," it has lately been said, "must not be suppressed. The Articles were prepared by Cranmer, in the summer of 1551, and Bucer died in the *succeeding* February. Before his death, Calvin appears to have obtained a copy of the first draft, or at least an accurate account of it; and he attributed the formation of it to Bucer." But Bucer died in the February[2] *preceding* the summer of 1551, and before that time there is no evidence of the Articles having been drawn into any form whatever. It is usually said, that Cranmer declined the *offered* assistance of Calvin in the present labour; that he knew the man, that is, he knew the violence of his opinions. But to the Genevan Reformer he certainly[3] appears to have communicated his design of the Articles. From the candour and moderation of Melancthon, however, he had[4] already derived advantage to his proceedings in the cause of the Reformation. To the Confession of Augsburg, principally the work of Melancthon, again he therefore directed his attention as to the basis, upon which the structure he was ordered to build should stand. That Confession is[5] decidedly Anti-Calvinistical.

[1] Review of Abp. Laurence's Sermons, Brit. Crit. vol. xxvii. p. 412.

[2] See before, p. 197.

[3] See vol. i. p. 336.

[4] See before, p. 226.

[5] Bp. Tomline, Refut. of Calvinism.

"[1] It is certain," a very convincing writer has said, "that archbishop Cranmer was one of the chief composers of our Articles, and whoever were besides, they had more respect to the Confession of Augsburg than to any other, as appears by *the very* [2] *identity of many of the Articles.* And the principal of our churchmen at that time had more familiarity with Melancthon and Erasmus than any other divines, singularly approving their expositions of the sacred Scriptures, and of the principal articles of the Christian faith; insomuch that they caused to be translated into English Erasmus's Paraphrase on the Gospels, and enjoined it to be studied by priests, and to lie ready in [3] churches for all men to read, and as it

[1] Plaifere, Cambridge Tracts, 1719, p. 16.

[2] See the Agreement of the Lutheran Churches with the Church of England, 1715, p. 1—12. And Examen Harmoniæ Religionis Ecclesiæ Lutheranæ et Anglicanæ, &c. à Jac. Serenio, Ecc. Suec. Lond. Pastore, Ludg. Bat. 1726, p. 1—88.

[3] Our Reformers placed in churches "for the purposes of instructing both clergy and laity in the true sense of Scripture, and in the just principles of the Reformation, not Luther's Commentary on the Galatians, though that had been published twenty-three years before; nor yet Calvin's Institutes, though that was likewise in being; but the Paraphrase of that very man Erasmus, *who had confuted them both.* And can you wish or desire a stronger proof that our Reformers were not Calvinists as to the Calvinistical five-point controversy, than this now before us?" Dean Tucker, Lett. to Dr. Kippis, 1773, p. 99.

were to drink in the doctrine of the Scriptures according to Erasmus's interpretation."

But the seventeenth Article, *Of Predestination and Election,* has been especially cited as a signal proof of submission by our Reformers, in the reign of Edward, to the doctrine of Calvin. What does the Article, however, profess? Dr. Waterland, whom no one yet has been able to confute, thus informs us. "[1] The Article of Predestination has been vainly enough urged in favour of the Calvinistical tenets. For, not to mention the saving clause in the conclusion, or its saying nothing at all of reprobation, and nothing in favour of *absolute* predestination to life, there seems to be a plain distinction, (as Plaifere has well observed,) in the Article itself, of two kinds of predestination, one which is recommended to us, the other condemned. Predestination, rightly and piously considered, that is, considered (not *irrespectively,* not *absolutely,* but) with respect to faith in Christ, faith working by love, and persevering: such a predestination is a sweet and comfortable doctrine. But the sentence of God's predestination, (it is not here said *in Christ* as before,) that sentence, *simply* or *absolutely* considered, (as *curious* and *carnal* persons are apt to consider it,) is a most *dangerous downfall,* lead-

[1] Cited by Dr. Winchester in his Tract on our seventeenth Article, 1773, p. 26.

ing either to *security* or *desperation*, as having no respect to foreseen *faith* and a *good life*, but *antecedent* in order to it. The Article then seems to speak of two subjects; first, of predestination soberly understood with respect to faith *in Christ*, which is wholesome doctrine; secondly, of predestination *simply* considered, which is a dangerous doctrine. And the latter part seems to be intended against those gospellers, of whom bishop [1] Burnet speaks. Nor is it imaginable that any *true* and *sound* doctrine of the Gospel should, of itself, have any aptness to become a *downfall* even to *carnal* persons: but *carnal* persons are apt to

[1] "The doctrine of Predestination, having been generally taught by the Reformers, many of this sect (the gospellers) began to make strange inferences from it; reckoning that since every thing was decreed, and the decrees of God could not be frustrated, therefore men were to leave themselves to be carried by those decrees. This drew some into great impiety of life, and others into desperation. The Germans soon saw the ill effects of this doctrine. Luther changed his mind about it, and Melancthon openly wrote against it. And since that time the whole stream of the Lutheran Church has run the other way. But both Calvin and Bucer were still for maintaining the doctrine of these decrees; only they warned the people not to think much of them, since they were secrets which men could not penetrate into. But they did not so clearly shew how these consequences did not flow from such opinions. Hooper and many other good writers, did often dehort the people from entering into these curiosities; and a caveat to the same purpose was put afterwards into the Article of the Church about Predestination." Burnet, Hist. Ref. ii. 113.

corrupt a sound doctrine, and suit it to their own lusts and passions, thereby falsifying the truth. This doctrine, so *depraved* and *mistaken*, our Church condemns; that is, she condemns *absolute, irrespective* predestination, not the other."

The latter part of this Article, twice noticed in the preceding extract, is indeed in perfect accordance, first, with Melancthon's smaller statement in the Augsburg formulary; and, afterwards, with the more extensive illustration of the point in the Confession of Saxony by him also framed. The agreement, so decisive against Calvinism, shall be shewn.

I. We must receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in holy Scripture; and, in our doings, that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared to us in the Word of God. *Article* XVII. 1552.

II. There is no need here of disputing concerning predestination, and the like; for the promise is general, and detracts nothing from our doings, but rather stirs us up to faith and truly good works. *Augsb. Confession. Of Faith.*

III. Because we propose to administer consolation to the consciences of the penitent, we forbear any questions about predestination or election. We lead all our readers to the Word of God, and desire them to learn His will from His own Word;—and not to search after other spe-

culations. Most certainly as the preaching of repentance relates to all men, and implies an accusation against all, so the promise is universal; and the offer of forgiveness is made to all, according to those general declarations of Holy Writ, Come unto me, all ye that travel and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest: Whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life: The same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon Him: God hath concluded all in unbelief, that He might have mercy upon all. In these universal promises let each person believe that he himself is included, and not give way to despair. Let every one strive to obey the Word of God, and follow the suggestions of His Holy Spirit, praying earnestly for assistance, according to that saying of the Evangelist St. Luke, How much more will He give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him. *Sax. Confess. Of the Remission of Sins, and of Justification.*

Again let us witness Cranmer and Melancthon, in judicious harmony upon a point that Calvin would refuse to yield them.

I. They are to be condemned which say, They can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place for penitents to such as truly repent and amend their lives. *Article* XV. 1552.

II. They condemn those, who contend that some arrive at such perfection in this life, as that they can sin no more: They condemn the

Novatians, who refuse to absolve those, who, having fallen after baptism, return to repentance. *Augsb. Confess. Article* XI.

Again, in the admission of universal redemption, excluded from the narrow creed of Calvin.

I. The offering of Christ, made once for ever, is the perfect redemption, the pacifying of God's displeasure, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or sin, were forged fables and dangerous deceits. *Article* XXX. 1552.

II. The passion of Christ was that oblation and satisfaction not only for original guilt, but for all other sins. And by this one oblation hath he perfected for ever them that are sanctified. We therefore teach that the opinion, that the Supper of the Lord is a work which, being applied for others, whether living or dead, merits for them the remission of pain and guilt, is false and impious. *Augsb. Confess. Of Abuses.*

"[1] Consistently with this doctrine," a learned divine of our Church has powerfully observed, "I cannot possibly interpret the Article concerning Predestination, so as to exclude any person

[1] Charge relative to the Articles, &c. by Archdeacon Tottie &c. Sermons, &c. Oxf. 1775, p. 375, seq.

whatsoever from the benefits of this expiatory sacrifice by a supposed absolute, unconditional, irreversible decree of God, subsisting from all eternity. Not a single person is excluded by the Article of Christ's Oblation from the benefit of Christ's redemption: that of Predestination therefore does not only not require, but will not allow, me to receive it in a sense, which of necessity shuts out the greater part of the world from a possibility of salvation. The notion of universal redemption runs through all the offices of our LITURGY, *which may be considered, in general, as the best comment upon the* ARTICLES, *and a sure criterion of the sense of the compilers of them;* and wherein we do not find the least countenance given in any one instance to the rigid notions of Calvinism. The point of universal redemption is the chief article of the dispute betwixt the Arminians and Calvinists, and (as the learned Dr. Whitby observes) *draws all the rest after it.* The Church, therefore, in this leading and fundamental point of all, opposes in direct terms the doctrine of Calvin."

This opinion of universal redemption, the great father of our Church uniformly maintains, from the time that the last public formulary in the reign of Henry appeared, till the moment when he poured forth his final prayer as a martyr. "God is naturally good, and willeth all men to be saved, and careth for them, and provideth all things by

which they may be saved, except by their own malice they will be evil, and so by righteous judgment of God perish and be lost. For truly men are to themselves the authors of sin and damnation. God is neither author of sin, nor the cause of damnation." So Cranmer wrote in 1543. At the same time he directed "all fantastical imagination, and curious reasoning, and vain trust of predestination, to be laid apart. And according to the plain manner of speaking and teaching of Scripture, in innumerable instances, we ought evermore to be in dread of our own frailty, and natural pronity to fall into sin, and not to assure ourselves that we are elected any otherwise than by feeling of spiritual motions in our heart, and by the tokens of good and virtuous living, in following the grace of God, and persevering in the same to the end."

Thus in his Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in 1550, explaining at large the sacrifice of Christ, he says, "Now we may look for none other priest, nor sacrifice, to take away our sins, but only him and his sacrifice. And as he, dying once, was offered for all, so, as much as pertained to him, he took all men's sins unto himself. So that now there remaineth no more sacrifices for sin, but extreme judgment at the last day, when he shall appear to us again.

Thus too, at his last hour, he exclaimed, "The great mystery that God became man was not wrought for little or few offences. Thou didst not give Thy Son, O heavenly Father, unto death

for small sins only, but for all the greatest sins of the world, so that the sinner return to Thee with his whole heart, as I do here at this present."

But the doctrine of unconditional decrees is by some supposed to be maintained in his Article of Free-Will. As Cranmer framed it, and as Melancthon also in his formulary suggested it, these are the words:

I. We have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ [1] preventing us, that we may have a good will, and [2] working in us when we have that good will. *Article* IX. 1552.

II. We confess there is a free-will in all men, having the judgment of reason, but not that which is sufficient for those things which pertain to God, so as without God either to begin them, or rightly to perform them.—In these there is a necessity of our being governed and assisted by the Holy Spirit, as St. Paul saith, "The Spirit helpeth our infirmity." *Augsb. Conf. Article* XVIII.

[1] Preceding as a guide. "Let thy grace, O Lord, always *prevent* and follow us." Collect.

[2] Burnet reads "working *with* us," and so the Article of 1571. "Working *in* us," is from *Phil.* ii. 13. where Whitby says, all the Greek interpreters observe that St. Paul describes God working in us not as denying our free-will, or constraining the unwilling, but because, finding a readiness of mind, He increaseth it by His grace; and because He works together, co-operates, with those who work out their own salvation with fear and trembling.

The English Article indeed is but a repetition of what Cranmer long before had taught, "[1] As many things are in the Scripture," he said, "which do shew free-will to be in man; so there are no fewer places in Scripture, which declare the grace of God to be so necessary, that if by it free-will be not prevented and holpen, it can neither do nor will any thing good and godly. Of which sort are three Scriptures following: *Without me ye can do nothing. No man cometh to me, except it be given him of my Father. We are not sufficient of ourselves, as of ourselves, to think any good thing.* According unto which Scriptures, and such other like, it followeth, that free-will, before it may will or think any godly thing, must be holpen by the grace of Christ, and by his Spirit be prevented and inspired, that it may be able thereto; and, being so made able, may from thenceforth work together with grace; and by the same sustained, holpen, and maintained, may do and accomplish good works, and avoid sin, and persevere also and increase in grace. It is surely of the grace of God only, that first we are inspired and moved to any good thing; but to resist temptations, and to persist in goodness and go forward, it is both of the grace of God, and of our free-will and endeavour. And finally, after we have persevered to

[1] Necessary Erudition of a Christian Man, 1543. The Article of Free-Will.

the end, to be crowned with glory therefore, is the gift and mercy of God; who, of His bountiful goodness hath ordained that reward to be given, after this life, according to such good works as are done in this life by His grace."

This may be called an anticipatory exposition, as it were, of the Article before us; an exposition clear, animated, and "perfectly agreeable," as the Article itself has been pronounced, "to the doctrine of St. Paul, who does not make the operation of the Divine grace to be a reason for our doing nothing for ourselves, but on the contrary, it is the very reason given *why we should work out our own salvation.* For though our own strength is not sufficient, yet our weakness will be made strong by the grace of God disposing us to begin, and enabling us to perform, the work. When I allow, therefore, that a man cannot by his own natural powers, make either a beginning, or progress, in the Christian life without the grace of God *preventing* or disposing him, and co-operating or *working with* him; as it is evident by the word co-operating (or *working in* or *with*) that the Article does not reject the use and effect of men's natural powers in the case, so neither does it restrain the influence of God's grace to any particular persons, but leaves all men under a capacity of receiving it in such measure as it shall please God to bestow it. The nice scholastic distinctions concerning the metaphysical nature, kinds, and operations of

grace, the Article has no concern with; nor have they any concern with the faith of a Christian."

The point of justification, and the sense in which Cranmer meant that it should be understood, have in these pages already been briefly noticed, where the [1] last public formulary of Henry, and the [2] first of Edward, are described. The Article of the archbishop upon this subject is concise, but refers to a very comprehensive statement of it in one of the homilies, of which [3] himself was the author; a statement, which maintains other doctrine than the Calvinistic, of salvation through faith alone. The Augsburg Confession pronounces that "by faith we believe, that for the sake of Christ are granted to us remission of sins and justification; *a doctrine that brings sure comfort to troubled minds.*" Thus the English Article, of which an ample exposition from the homily shall also be cited.

I. Justification by only faith in Jesus Christ, in that sense as it is declared in the Homily of [4] Justification, is *a most certain and wholesome doctrine for Christian men.* Article XI. 1552.

II. The Homily accordingly tells us, "that

[1] See vol. i. p. 340. [2] See the present vol. p. 13.

[3] Ibid. p. 10.

[4] The Homily is not precisely so entitled, but is called "An Homily of the Salvation of Mankind, by only Christ our Saviour from sin and death everlasting."

this sentence, that we be justified by faith only, is not so meant of the Fathers and other ancient authors, that the said justifying faith is *alone* in man, without true repentance, hope, charity, dread, and the fear of God, *at any time and season.* Nor when they say that we are justified freely, they mean not that we should or might afterward be idle, and that nothing should be required on our parts afterward: neither mean they that we are so to be justified without our good works, that we should do no good works at all. But this saying, that we are justified by faith only, freely, and without works, is spoken for to take away clearly all *merit* of our works, as being *insufficient* to deserve our justification at God's hands, and thereby most plainly to express the *weakness* of man, and the goodness of God; the great *infirmity* of ourselves, and the might and power of God; the *imperfectness* of our own works, and the most abundant grace of our Saviour Christ; and, therefore, wholly to ascribe the merit and deserving of our justification unto Christ only, and his most precious blood-shedding." Again, "The true understanding of this doctrine, We are justified freely by faith without works, or that we are justified by faith in Christ only, is not, that this our own act to believe in Christ, or this our faith in Christ, which is within us, doth justify us, and deserve our justification unto us; (for that were to count ourselves to be justified

by some act, or virtue, that is within ourselves;) but the true understanding and meaning thereof is, that, although we hear God's Word, and believe it, although we have faith, hope, charity, repentance, dread, and fear of God, within us, and do never so many works thereunto; yet we must renounce the merit of all our said virtues, of faith, hope, charity, and all other virtues, and good deeds, which we either *have done*, shall do, or can do, as things that are far too *weak*, and *insufficient*, and *imperfect*, to *deserve* remission of our sins, and justification. And, therefore, we must trust only in God's mercy, and that sacrifice which our High Priest and Saviour, Christ Jesus, the Son of God, once offered for us upon the cross, to obtain thereby God's grace, and remission as well of our original sin in baptism, as of all actual sins committed by us after baptism, *if we truly repent, and unfeignedly turn to Him again.* So that as great and as godly a virtue as the lively faith is, yet it putteth us from itself, and remitteth or appointeth us unto Christ for to have, only by him, remission of our sins or justification. So that our faith in Christ saith unto us thus, It is not I that take away your sins, but it is Christ only; and to him only I send you for that purpose, [1] renouncing therein all your good virtues, words,

[1] That is, renouncing the pretended merit of all your good works, &c. Cranmer's early editions of the homily here read *renouncing*; later, *forsaking*.

thoughts, and works, and only putting your trust in Christ. Thus you see, that the very true sense of this proposition or saying, *We are justified by faith, in Christ only,* according to the meaning of the ancient authors, is this: We put our faith in Christ, that we are justified by him only, that we are justified by God's free mercy, and the merits of our Saviour Christ only, and by no virtue or good work of our own that is in us, or that we can be able to have, or to do, for to *deserve* the same; Christ himself being the only *cause meritorious* thereof."

Cranmer thus supposed, it has hence been [1] argued, not only the possibility of the existence of good works prior to our justification, (which a Calvinist can never do, consistently with his genuine principles,) but also he required the actual pre-existence of them, as necessary conditions, though he excluded them as meritorious causes. Proceeding in the renunciation of merit, "he equally renounces the supposed merit of pre-existent faith with that of pre-existent works. Indeed, he calls faith itself a virtue, and a good work; both which it certainly is; and the opposition which he intended was not between faith and works, which is the Calvinistical system, but between Christ and works; that is, he asserts, that there was no human merit of any kind, either of congruity or condig-

[1] By Dean Tucker, Letter to Dr. Kippis, p. 111.

nity, to obtain justification from the hands of God; but that Christ alone was the meritorious cause." In opposition to the Romish doctrine of human merit, as well as to the solifidianism of certain Protestants, this homily was therefore written by Cranmer. How it was regarded, in the latter of these applications, by the acutest and closest disputant of his times, I mean the author of The Religion of Protestants a safe way to Salvation, the following brief, but most impressive observation will shew: " [1] The faith which is *alone*, and unaccompanied with sincere and universal obedience, is to be esteemed not faith, but presumption, and is *at no hand sufficient unto justification;* and though charity be not imputed unto justification, yet it is required as a necessary disposition in the person to be justified; and though, in regard of the *imperfection* of it, no man can be justified by it, yet, on the other side, no man can be justified without it."

While Cranmer had been employed upon this important subject, his kinsman Osiander, then professor of divinity at Konigsberg, had been engaged in controversy relating to it with many of the Lutheran divines. His notions were very different from those of the archbishop. Mosheim represents them often as obscure and contradictory. Bellarmine, indeed, has observed, that the

[1] Chillingworth, chap. vii. sect. 32.

professor mentions twenty differences of opinion upon the point of justification. John à Lasco, at this time resident at Croydon with Cranmer, laments in a [1] letter to his friend Hardenberg the disputes thus excited by the [2] publications of Osiander; and there can be little doubt that, in conversation with his host, he had found him also deeply vexed by the injudicious conduct of his German relation.

I have thus endeavoured to shew, in opposition to the [3] assertion of Mosheim, *the rule of our national faith* to be not Calvinistical. How that rule has rejected also the principal errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome, we may now briefly observe. With the Confession of Augsburg [4] it has condemned the invocation of saints, and the sacrifices of masses, in which it was commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or sin. With the same formulary it has allowed, what the Romish Church rejects, the marriage of the clergy. Transubstantiation [5] it has denied, as being incapable of proof by Holy Writ; and twice has it affirmed,

[1] Gerdesii Miscell. ii. 678.

[2] They occasioned numerous answers, both in German and Latin, from 1550 to 1553.

[3] See before, p. 267.

[4] Art. xxiii. 1552, and Art. xxx. Ibid. Of Abuses, &c. and, Of the Marriage of Priests. Augsb. Conf.

[5] Art. xxix. 1552.

after having stated the sacraments to be only those of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, that "the sacraments of Christ were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them;" and that, in particular, "[1] the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped." These were points upon which Cranmer had long before given his opinion, and upon which in his Defence of the true doctrine of the Sacrament he thus expatiated: "[2] What need the people to run from their seats to the altar, and from altar to altar, and from sacring (as they called it) to sacring, peeping, [3] tooting, and gazing at that thing which the priest held up in his hands, if they thought not to honour that thing which they saw? What moved the priests to lift up the sacrament so high over their heads? Or the people to cry to the priest, *Hold up, hold up;* and one man to say to another, *Stoop down before;* or to say, *This day I have seen my Maker;* and, *I cannot be quiet, except I see my Maker once a day?* What was the cause of all these, and that as well the priest as the people so devoutly did knock, and kneel, at every sight of the sacrament, but that they worshipped, that

[1] Art. xxix. 1552.

[2] Def. edit. 1550. fol. 101.

[3] Looking about. A word frequent in our old authors, and still a provincial one.

visible thing which they saw with their eyes, and and took it for very God?" In [1] other Articles, the archbishop also guards against the celebration of mass, and the elevation of the host, enacting, that no rite or ceremony, no mode or form of worship whatever, was to be retained, or appointed, if contrary to the written Word of God.

The doctrine of the schoolmen also concerning purgatory, pardons, worshipping and adoration as well of images as of relics, against which he had often contended, was [2] now declared a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather perniciously repugnant to the Word of God.

It was not till the fifth year of Elizabeth's reign, that these Articles of Edward received any alteration. They were then submitted to a [3] committee of the lower house of convocation for such addition, or correction, as might be thought convenient. Very few were the amendments, but the [4] number of them was reduced to thirty-nine. They are recited, it must be added, as having been [5] agreed upon by the synod of 1552;

[1] Art. xxi. and xxxiii. 1552. [2] Art. xxiii. 1552.

[3] Regist. Convoc. Bennet, Ess. on the Thirty-nine Articles, p. 167.

[4] Burnet and Collier have printed the whole of the two compilations, stating the differences between them.

[5] Regist. Convoc. ut supr.

an assumption, which archbishop Parker would hardly have allowed, if they had not possessed the authority which their title records. But this authority has been rendered questionable by what Foxe relates of Cranmer in his disputation at Oxford, when a prisoner, with Dr. Weston.

"[1] Weston. You have set forth a Catechism in the name of the synod of London, and yet there be fifty, which, witnessing that they were of the number of the convocation, never heard one word of this Catechism.

"Cranmer. I was ignorant of the setting to of that title; and, as soon as I had knowledge thereof, I did not like it. Therefore when I complained thereof to the Council, it was answered me by them, that the book was so entitled, because it was set forth in the time of the convocation."

This answer elicits from Collins the remark, that "out of respect to the excellent martyr," he copies it, as "clearly shewing his honesty and integrity in the whole affair." Neal, in his History of the Puritans, also quotes it; and bishop Maddox, in answer to him, [2] considers the Catechism only, and not the Articles, as intended by the archbishop; there not being indeed annexed to the Catechism that assertion of convocational

[1] Foxe, Acts and Mon. 1440.

[2] Vindication of the Ch. of Eng. 1733, p. 309.

approbation which accompanied the Articles, though both were sometimes printed together, and both were sanctioned by royal authority. The Articles are, however, included under the appellation of the Catechism in Cranmer's own admission before his enemies, when he said "[1] that he gave his advice as to the setting forth the Catechism and the Articles with it, that he compelled none of the clergy to subscribe them, but that many in the province of Canterbury had voluntarily subscribed." At this final and elaborate examination of him, no charge is adduced of a false statement in the title of the Articles by any of the witnesses against him; one of whom, when Ridley at Oxford disputed immediately after Cranmer, appears at once to allow the synodical authority so repeatedly assumed for the Articles, whose words Foxe has recorded without any remark, notwithstanding what he had just before related, as seeming to impugn that authority. [2] Ward, the opponent to Ridley, was the bitter and ungenerous enemy of Cranmer; but he brings

[1] Process. Lambeth MSS. No. 1136. "Quod attinet ad Catechismum, &c." See before, p. 62, note 2. Dr. Smith, one of the witnesses against Cranmer, describes the union of the Catechism and Articles thus, "Quod attinet ad Catechismum et Articulos annexos, &c."

[2] See what is said of him in the present vol. p. 47, note 2, and p. 61, note 3.

no accusation against him, as Weston is said to have done, on the present point. He thus addresses Ridley also without such censure.

" [1] Ward. You, being brought into the briars, seemed to doubt of Christ's presence on the earth: to the proof of which matter I will bring nothing else than *that which was agreed upon in the Catechism of the synod of London,* set out not long ago by you.

" Ridley. Sir, I give you to wit, before you go any further, that I did set out no Catechism.

" Weston. Yes, you made me subscribe to it, when you were a bishop in your ruff,

" Ridley. I compelled no man to subscribe.

" Ward. Yes, by the rood, you are the very author of that heresy.

" Ridley. I put forth no Catechism.

" Cole. Did you never consent to the setting out of those things which you allowed ?

" Ridley. I grant that I saw the book ; but I deny that I wrote it. I perused it after it was made, and I noted many things for it : so I consented to the book : I was not the author of it.

" The Judges. The Catechism is so set forth, as though the [2] whole convocation-house had

[1] Acts and Mon. 1449.

[2] The Articles certainly have not the title worded in such terms of extent and comprehension, *as these judges pretend.* They profess only to have been agreed upon in the synod by the bishops and certain other learned men; whence it seems pro-

agreed to it. Cranmer said yesterday that you made it.

"Ridley. I think surely that he would not say so.

"Ward. The Catechism hath this clause: Si visibiliter, et in terra, etc.

"Ridley. I answer, that those Articles were set out, I both willing and consenting to them. Mine own hand will testify the same; and M. Cranmer put his hand to them likewise, and gave them to others afterwards."

Whatever, lastly, may be thought of the synodical authority of these our first Articles, it cannot be denied, that to almost every decision or regulation of Cranmer, to his learning, his zeal, and his discretion, it is still that unfeigned assent is the indispensable condition of qualifying for their ministry, and their preferment, the clergy of the Church of England.

bable, as I have observed, that the Articles might be passed by a committee. See before, p. 290, and Collier, ii. 325. Strype, Ecc. Mem. ii. 368.

CHAPTER XIII.

1552 to 1553.

The Reformation of Ecclesiastical Laws.

The Liturgy was under revision, and the Articles were in preparation, when the attention of Cranmer was also again employed upon the design of establishing a code of canon law, which appears to have been [1] first proposed, immediately after the abolition of the papal power in this country. Towards the close of Henry's days a [2] scheme of it was drawn up. In the present reign, the subject had been revived at the beginning of it, and the promulgation of the code was expected in the last year of it. Whether, by the death of Henry, or some other cause, the plan in his time had been

[1] See vol. i. p. 104.

[2] The book itself was required to be seen by Henry, and Cranmer promised it should be immediately sent. See before, vol. i. pp. 359, 360. See also Strype's Life of Cranmer. B. i. ch. 30.

rendered abortive, is uncertain. That by the death of Edward it now was, is the frequent assertion of historical writers. Some, however, have thought [1] that the severity of the code would never have been endured in this country, and that this is the true reason why it was laid aside. Others, [2] that in that age of licentiousness, which ill could brook restraint, some art was employed to prevent the confirmation of it. The observation of Cox, who was one of the eight commissioners chosen to finish it for publication, has been cited in aid of this opinion. Only a few days before the meeting, for the accomplishment of what had so often been talked of, and of which the substance must have been generally known, he wrote to Bullinger, at Zurich, telling him that the liturgy had been revised, "[3] but we hate," said he, "the bitter institutions of Christian discipline;" and he therefore entreated Bullinger to exert [4] his interest with the nobility, and other distinguished persons, in behalf of spiritual jurisdiction; considering it, no doubt, when "[5] aided by the civil power, as the best safeguard of a

[1] Hallam, Constit. Hist. of Eng. 2d edit. i. 139.

[2] Ridley, Life of Ridley, p. 352.

[3] Strype, Ecc. Mem. ii. 366.

[4] Bullinger was much attached to England. See before, p. 223. To our Universities he sent several of his young countrymen. By our Reformers he was greatly regarded.

[5] Hallam, ut supr.

Christian commonwealth against vice." In fact, the prelates of the realm had long before occasioned the legislative nomination of the [1] thirty-two commissioners for the accomplishment of the present work, by their complaint, to the house of lords, of the great increase of immorality, and by their desire to be supplied with laws which should enable them to suppress it. In November 1551, Edward nominated eight of these thirty-two commissioners to lay first before the remainder of them, afterwards before himself and his Privy Council, the intended code. At the head of these eight persons was the archbishop, to whom the subject was so familiar, an abler canonist than him not being easily to be found within the realm. The book was ready for the inspection of the king some months before he died, but there is no evidence that he ever saw it. His commission indeed, as that of Henry had also been, was prepared to introduce this body of laws to the public; and both are prefixed to the edition of the book, published in 1571 under the direction of archbishop Parker, by Foxe the martyrologist, with the title of *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum.* The compilation is supposed to have been originally made in English, and to have received from Haddon, the king's professor of civil law at Cambridge, with the assistance of Sir John Cheke,

[1] Collier, ii. 287.

the elegant Latin shape, "[1] the correct and beautiful style," that distinguishes it. It was distributed into fifty-one titles, to bring it near to the number of those in Justinian's celebrated digest of the Roman civil law; besides an appendix, *De regulis juris*, in imitation of the same addition to printed copies of the pandects. In the name of the king the whole law runs. The supremacy, acknowledged in his father, is [2] thought to have occasioned this form. The authority of Edward, however, for its establishment, as I have said, was not obtained. But the project did not die with him, as some modern writers have asserted. The reign of Elizabeth witnessed not merely the publication of it, which we have just noticed, but before that time an [3] attempt to establish such a work, and in the very year of the publication another to obtain, for what Cranmer had so long before compiled, the sanction of the legislature. At the commencement of the parliamentary session, in 1571, the puritan members in the house of commons, who were desirous of assuming every thing to themselves, claimed this sanction

[1] Collier. [2] Ibid.

[3] "Petition is to be made to the queen's Majesty and the parliament, that, according to a statute, anno 25 Hen. VIII. thirty-two persons may be appointed to collect and gather ecclesiastical laws, and to view those that were gathered by commissioners in king Edward's time." Strype, Annal. Ref. Eliz. under 1562. ch. 27.

for it. Elizabeth, jealous of their encroachment upon her supremacy, checked the wish, it has been said, by a message to them, "[1] that she approved their good endeavours, but would not suffer these things to be ordered by parliament." Nor was the designed revival of the code further agitated. In that year, however, "[2] a book of certain canons, concerning *some part* of the discipline of the Church of England," was subscribed in convocation, by the bishops, and printed first in English, afterwards in Latin; the latter form being sometimes an accompaniment to editions of the thirty-nine Articles in that language, as they were published in 1571.

Cranmer's *Reformatio Legum*, although unpossessed of public authority, has often been appealed to as a record of very great importance. In our senate, and in our courts of law, it has been cited to illustrate points of ecclesiastical jurisprudence. By our divines it is frequently brought forward as a comment on the Articles of Religion. But it has incurred deep censure, as retaining the pontifical law of death.

The first two titles relate to Christian doctrine, and are, 1. *Of the Trinity and the Catholic Faith.* 2. *Of Heresies.* It is under the first of these, that the penalty of death is absolutely declared against such as should deny the Christian religion.

[1] Collier.

[2] Printed by John Day.

In cases of heresy also, it has been asserted by Collier and Dr. Lingard, that the code, in the third chapter, directs the obstinate heretic to be delivered to the civil magistrate, that he may *suffer death* according to law. Burnet, on the other hand, affirms, that capital punishments for heretical offences are not retained in it. The words of the code are, that after all endeavours of reclaiming the heretic have failed, then he is to be sent to the civil magistrate *to be punished;* "consumptis omnibus aliis remediis, ad extremum ad civiles magistratus ablegetur *puniendus.*" Hence it has been powerfully observed, "that [1] infamy and civil disability seem to be the only punishments intended to be kept up, except in case of the denial of the Christian religion; for if a heretic were, as a matter of course, to be burned, it seems needless to provide, as in this chapter, that he should be incapable of being a witness, or of making a will." Still the learned author of this remark hesitates to pronounce Dr. Lingard mistaken, but omits not the observation of the latter "that, within a short time (from the final preparation of this code) Cranmer and his associates perished in the flames, which they had prepared to kindle for the destruction of their opponents." In the same spirit Mr. Butler has asserted, that the archbishop and his fellow-reformers [2] wished Mary

[1] Hallam, ut supr. [2] Book of the Rom. Cath. Church.

and her associates to be exposed to their projected persecutions. A strange assertion, if we call to mind only that Cranmer and Ridley had [1] recommended a connivance at Mary's adherence to her religious opinions, and that in the reign of her father Cranmer had [2] saved her from his indignation, which threatened her life; an assertion too that perhaps would not have been made, if the writer of it had seen the corrected copy, which was Cranmer's, of the laws to which he alludes. But of this anon. Ridley and Cranmer, however, had consented to "[3] burning the anabaptist," and therefore they have been denounced as "preparing to burn the Roman Catholic" also. "The former, by the existing law," Dr. Lingard observes, "was already liable to the penalty of death." True; (such had been a law enacted in the time of Henry, not in that of Edward,) and upon Joan of Kent and Van Paris it was inflicted. Almost immediately afterwards, as if averse to such methods of persecution, Cranmer scruples not to [4] tell Gardiner, as I had occasion before to relate, "that the truth hath been hid these many years, and persecuted by the papists *with fire and fagot, and should be so yet still, if you might have your own will.*" These are words, which surely indicate

[1] See before, p. 264.

[2] Burnet ii. 241. "Cranmer is said to have persuaded Henry not to put his daughter Mary to death, *which we must in charity hope she did not know.*" Hallam. 2nd ed. i. 131.

[3] Lingard, 8vo. edit. vii. 258.

[4] See before, p. 152.

a wish to suppress, rather than to countenance, the penalty of death. We shall presently read other words that seem to confirm the wish. Meantime let all be heard against the archbishop. "By the new canon of the law metropolitan," Dr. Lingard continues, " to believe in transubstantiation, to admit the papal supremacy, and to deny justification by faith only, were severally made heresy; and it was ordained that individuals accused of holding heretical opinions should be arraigned before the spiritual courts; should be excommunicated on conviction; and after a respite of sixteen days, should, if they continued obstinate, be delivered to the civil magistrate to suffer the punishment provided by law. Fortunately for the professors of the ancient faith, Edward died before this code had obtained the sanction of the legislature; and by the accession of Mary, the power of the sword passed from the hands of one religious party to those of the other." Indeed that power, which had been exercised in the miserable instances only of Van Paris and Joan of Kent, during the reign of Edward, was soon found in that of Mary to be the " sword going through the land." Hence it has been justly observed, "[1] that as no religion can expiate, so no provocation can justify, no resentment can excuse, that uninterrupted series of deliberate barbarity which marks every page of her unprosperous annals with martyrdom,

[1] Warton's life of Sir Thomas Pope, p. 60.

hardly to be paralleled in the pagan persecutions of primitive Christianity." But we are not yet arrived at her reign. Thus much also might be said for Cranmer and his associates, that at least they were in no haste to display the persecuting spirit of which they are accused. Ere the code should be produced for legislative confirmation, three years, it was resolved in 1549, should from that time elapse. The milder punishments than that of death, as awaiting even the most obstinate cases of heresy, we are now to behold its evident intention of ordaining. And who will not be gratified to find "[1] Cranmer and his associates" thus repelling the accusation that sanguinary purposes were theirs, that for the destruction of their heretical opponents they were ready to light the flames?

There is a manuscript copy[2] of this code, which belonged to Cranmer, in the British Museum. It contains several additions and corrections, which, had Cranmer published the compilation, would doubtless have been made by the press as well as the pen. They were probably the final revisions of the code, when the sanction of the le-

[1] See before, p. 330.

[2] Harl. MSS. 426. entitled, "the eleventh volume of Mr. John Foxe's papers, bought of Mr. Strype; which also Mr. Strype described in the following words, Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum ab archiepiscopo Cantuar. aliisque selectis viris composita: *This was Cranmer's own book, with his own hand, and Peter Martyr's, in several places.*"

gislature for it was expected. That sanction not being obtained, copies of the code were however preserved; and from one of them, [1] said to be compared with this of Cranmer's, which had been transcribed by his secretary, but by his own and the hand of Peter Martyr amended, Foxe published it in 1571. The archiepiscopal manuscript had also become [2] his property; it next was Strype's; it is now the nation's. But neither by Strype, nor by Foxe, was observed the important addition, which follows *puniendus* in the chapter of the code that has been cited. The addition is first *exilio vel æterno carcere*, (the punishment of exile or perpetual imprisonment,) through which the pen being drawn, these penalties of incarceration and banishment are more precisely declared; and such a prudent infliction by the magistrates is also prescribed, as might help to reclaim the heretic from his error: "vel ut in perpetuum pellatur exilium, vel ad æternas carceris deprimatur tenebras, aut alioquin magistratûs prudenti consideratione plectendus, ut maximè illius conversioni expedire videbitur." I consider the hand-writing here as that of Martyr.

Thus much for the process against heretics, which the *third* title of the code intended to direct. In the *second* it is imagined that *predestination* is noticed "[3] with a shade more of Calvinism than

[1] By Strype, Life of Cranm. B. i. ch. 30.

[2] See the penultimate note.

[3] Hallam, 8vo. i. 139.

in the Articles." In the description of the Articles the subject has already been fully considered. I will only produce a brief defence of the present formulary also against Calvinism. It not only guards against that mistaken notion of predestination, in which men seek a cover for their wickedness, and by which they are led either into despair or a dissolute life, charging all their guilt upon God; but goes further than the Article, "[1] which takes no notice of reprobation; and here our Reformers condemn it as pleaded by the [2] gospellers, whose opinion concerning the doctrine itself could not be stronger than what Calvin had taught."

Burnet and Collier have given considerable extracts, in their histories, from the code before us. From these, and from *the book itself*, I may gather information, to some readers perhaps new; and therefore, I proceed to the remaining titles, in one or two of which a simplicity will be found, that probably may call up a passing smile.

The fourth title treats of blasphemy, and assigns to it the same punishment as to heresy.

The fifth relates to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, to the consecration of bishops and the ordination of priests and deacons, to the solemnization of marriage in the face of the congregation, to directions for those who are to be confirmed, and to the pastoral visitation of the sick.

[1] Dr. Winchester on the 17th Article, p. 53.

[2] See before, p. 304. n.

The sixth denounces not only idolatry, but also magic, witchcraft, consultation with conjurers, and divination by lots. If those, who offended in these points, submitted, they were to be punished at the discretion of the ecclesiastical judge; if they were obstinate, excommunication was to be the consequence. It may be added, that in the first Injunctions of queen Elizabeth, a similar prohibition was issued: "[1] Item, that no person shall use charms, sorcery, witchcraft, soothsaying, or any such-like devilish device, nor shall resort at any time to the same for counsel or help." Still more curious it is to observe, that in the reign of James the First, *sorcery*, or *divination by lots*, was made a felony; and that, at a much later period, our explanatory law-books continued to offer nice distinctions between *conjuration* and *witchcraft*, assigning however to both the character of personal conferences with the devil, but to *charms* that of ceremonial words alone, without such conferences.

The seventh provides for the due qualification of preachers; and that without episcopal authority none should exercise the function.

The eighth relates to marriage, which is left free to all, but which was not to be celebrated till after banns thrice published, and not to be esteemed lawful, if celebrated otherwise than directed by the Book of Common Prayer. The man, who

[1] Injunct. 1559. No. 32.

seduced the unsuspecting female, was to be excommunicated, unless he married her; and, if that could not be done, he was to assign to her a third part of his property; but if such satisfaction was impracticable also, other arbitrary punishments were to be inflicted. Marriages without the consent of parents or guardians, are declared null. Yet when the guardian, or parent, might be thought too severe in respect to the nuptial proposal, the young persons might apply to the ecclesiastical judge for their relief. Below the age of *twelve* no forward nymph, below that of *fourteen* no impatient swain, could claim this redress. Impediments of wedlock are then enumerated. Disparity of years, in the parties contracting it, is dissuaded. Polygamy is condemned. Marriages made by force are pronounced void; and the chapter closes with a censure upon women who refused to suckle their children, directing the preachers also to exhort them against a practice so falsely delicate and inhuman.

The ninth details the prohibited degrees of marriage, those in the Levitical law, or those that are reciprocal to them.

The tenth treats of adultery and divorce. The former crime it states to have been capitally punished both by the Mosaic and the Civil law. If a clergyman was convicted of it, to his wife and children he was to forfeit all his goods and estate, to lose his benefice, and to be banished or impri-

soned for life: if he had no such relations, to pious uses his property was to be assigned. A layman, it has been [1] before observed, was to give his wife her fortune, and also half his own; and to perpetual exile, or imprisonment, he is moreover condemned. In a similar manner the wife also is to be punished. But the innocent party might marry again; although reconciliation is recommended, in case there are any hopes of future good conduct; while the offending party, if there be no reconciliation, is debarred from any other marriage. Without a sentence of divorce, however, no marriage was to be dissolved. Desertion; long absence, that of two or three years being named; capital enmities, where one party might attempt the destruction of the other; the savage behaviour of the husband towards the wife, when not reclaimed by judicial admonition or the discipline of a prison; these might induce a regular divorce. To frailties of temper the legal separation was not allowed. The chapter proposes no more than that, if smaller quarrels or offences arise, the reconciliation of the parties should be urged by every method of persuasion as well as threat, or *that they should form no new connubial alliance.* An appeal to the ecclesiastical judge in such cases for a divorce, if the effect of these perpetual contentions were not the deadly enmity or cruel

[1] See the present vol. p. 29.

usage already noticed, is certainly not directed. He who prosecuted his wife for adultery, or for attempting his life, if he failed in evidence, was to forfeit half his estate to her, and to be debarred from alienating that moiety without her consent. She who, in like manner, accused without proof her husband, was neither to have her fortune returned, nor to receive any advantage which otherwise by him might accrue to her. In neither case was the marriage to be dissolved. He who should be pander to the dishonour of his wife, is subjected to punishment, but is not released from his adulterous partner. Upon either party, convicted of adultery, that might prove the same against the party impeaching, the same penalty is to fall, but to neither is divorce to be allowed. The encouragers of adultery, who to such purpose conveyed letters and messages, or lent their houses, are also to be punished at the discretion of the ecclesiastical judge. The customary separation from bed and board, the marriage remaining firm in other respects, is declared unreasonable, contrary to the Scriptures, introductive of great disorders, and therefore to be abolished. A very learned divine, who says that the doctrine of divorce may be called the cradle of the English Reformation, objects to the present code as "[1] at

[1] The Doctrine and Law of Marriage, Adultery, and Divorce, by H. D. Morgan, M.A. Oxf. 1826, vol. ii. p. 229.

variance with itself in contemplating the reconciliation of the parties in one case, their continued connexion in other cases, and the entire separation of one with a restriction upon the other in a third case, and that the whole doctrine proceeds on the assumption of two very questionable propositions, 1. that adultery is a dissolution of the bond of marriage; and 2. that adultery is meant in our Lord's clause of exception from the general indissolubility of marriage." Decisive was the opinion of one of our old theologians, whom I have [1] before noticed, in regard to these points, and who has written an extensive and very interesting treatise in support of it; premising, "[2] that whereas divers persons were persuaded, that for adultery they might sue the divorce, and marry again, and some accordingly did so; if the matter were well examined, that liberty would not, in my judgment, be found to have any undoubted warrant at all in the Word of God." He was opposed to an author of a contrary belief. But to epitomize their arguments is not required in such a work as the present. One more reference to Cranmer and his associates shall close the subject. "[3] Whatever was the

[1] See the present vol. p. 28.

[2] Of Divorce for Adultery, &c. by E. Bunney, B.D. Oxf. 1610. Adv. to the Reader.

[3] Rev. H. D. Morgan, ut supr. 232.

private disposition of the chief Reformers, in favour of a new theory of divorce, and however their disposition might be influenced by the conduct of the king, there was not in the reigns of Henry, Edward, or Mary, any effectual or decided opposition to the doctrine of the indissolubility of marriage, or any permanent or general abolition of the restricted nature of the divorce which was granted upon proof of adultery. The Reformers themselves, in the revised ritual of marriage, continued to affirm the ancient doctrine, that the parties should live together till death should [1] depart them."

The eleventh treats of admission to ecclesiastical benefices. The patron was to present no clerk, who was not duly qualified. If he reserved any of the profits of the living, he forfeited for that turn the presentation to it. The clerk presented, before he was admitted to the benefice, was to be examined by the archdeacon, and other [2] triers appointed by the bishop, in regard to the principal parts of religion, and to controversies respecting them. If he discovered ignorance in the Scriptures, or the maintenance of heretical opinions, he was inadmissible to the cure. Pluralities were

[1] Separate. Our old writers constantly use *depart* in this sense.

[2] Collier, not perceiving the rather ludicrous error of his printer, reads *friers*, and repeats it in his account of this title.

for the future disallowed; but the present possessors of them were not to be disturbed. Non-residence was not to be suffered, except age, sickness, or some other sufficient cause might justify it. Prebendaries, who had no particular cure, were to preach in neighbouring churches. Bastards, unless eminent for learning and good conduct, might not be admitted into holy orders. But the bastards of patrons, if presented by them, were to be dispossessed of the benefice, and the patronage of such turns to be lost to the owners. Personal defects, as blindness, stammering so as not to be understood, a distorted visage, and a breath so rank as not to be endured, are enumerated as disabilities for the ministerial office. A disclaimer upon oath of simoniacal contracts, and a promise in like manner, that they would do nothing to the prejudice of the Church, were also required of those who were to be admitted to benefices.

The twelfth and thirteenth titles relate merely to cessions, resignations, and exchanges of benefices.

The fourteenth states the method of clearing from imputation of guilt upon common report, or when a person was accused for any crime incompletely proved, or only by presumption. Such were to swear themselves innocent, and to be supported in their statement by four compurgators of their own rank, who upon their oath were to

affirm that they believed the statement to be true. To their reputation the judge was then to restore them. The purgations of the duel, of heated iron, and of scalding water, are forbidden. The public combat of the accuser and the accused, in the age of superstition, is well known; the other strange methods of repelling accusation, here mentioned, had been to touch a red-hot iron, either by taking up a bar, or by putting the hand into a heated gauntlet, or by walking blindfold over hot bars of iron; and if no mark of burning appeared in the hand or foot of the accused, he was acquitted; otherwise, he was pronounced guilty. With similar consequences drawn from it, the hand was also plunged into boiling water. These had been considered as divine judgments. The present code denounced them as insulting the Almighty, as well as not affording any means of ascertaining truth.

The fifteenth treats of dilapidations, and of the measures for repairing ecclesiastical houses.

The sixteenth relates to alienations of church-lands, and allows no leases of farms, made by ecclesiastics, either to exceed the term of ten years, or to bind the successor.

The seventeenth concerns elections in colleges and cathedrals: The eighteenth, collations to benefices and simoniacal contracts.

Divine service is the subject of the nineteenth.

In cathedrals and colleges the Common Prayer is to be used every morning, with the Litany on Wednesdays and Fridays, and the Communion Office on holidays. In cathedrals, the sermon is to be only in the afternoon, that the people may not be drawn from the preacher in the morning at their own parish-churches. In cathedrals also, both on holidays and Sundays, the communion is to be administered. In parish-churches there are to be sermons in the morning, but, except in large parishes, none in the afternoon, an hour in explaining the catechism being the general direction for this part of the day; after which service, the money given to charitable uses was to be distributed, and ecclesiastical discipline in regard to admonition, penance, or excommunication, to be put in practice. In singing the psalms, the clergy are required so to regulate their voice as to excite devotion, to confine themselves, as Cranmer[1] elsewhere has expressed it, to "a song not full of notes," especially to forbear the practice of the musical shake, which, it is said, would render the words unintelligible. In this plain psalmody the congregation too might join. In private chapels or houses, except in those of peers, and other persons of great quality, whose households were large, divine offices are not to be performed, lest

[1] See before, vol. i. p. 356.

under that pretence the parish-church might be deserted, and errors be more easily disseminated. To the sick, and to those who were very infirm, the Lord's Supper might be also administered at home. But, in these exceptions, all things were to be done according to the Book of Common Prayer.

Ecclesiastical offices are considered in the twentieth title; beginning with that of parish-clerk, not, as Burnet states it, of sexton, the person here intended by the Reformers being not the man of the "pick-axe and a spade," but he who is to teach the children of the parish the alphabet and the catechism, as well as to take care of the vestments, of the Bible and other books belonging to the church, to toll the bells, and to attend the minister in the celebration of the sacred offices; and if he neglected to give this instruction, is to be dismissed from the charge. His stipend is to be provided by the parish. The clergy are next especially noticed. If they are unmarried, they are to entertain in their houses no woman under the age of sixty, except their mothers, aunts, or sisters. To every rural deanery is to be appointed by the bishop a dean, who is to report to his diocesan, half-yearly, an account of his district as it respected both the laity and the clergy, and from the diocesan to signify his commands to the latter. Superior to them in rank, are the archdeacons, who are enjoined to reside within their jurisdiction,

and to visit the parochial clergy twice in the year. The visitations of bishops are to be once in three years, or oftener, and to be conducted at their own charge. To preach frequently in their cathedrals, to ordain none rashly or for rewards, to hold an annual synod, to bring up in their family persons designed for the ministry, to entertain no extravagant or fantastical guests, not to suffer their wives to be too gaily dressed or too triflingly employed; there also are directions to prelates. When sick or infirm, they were to be allowed a coadjutor. Once, during their incumbency, the two archbishops are to visit their respective provinces, to inquire of their suffragans as to the state of their dioceses, and upon any great occasion to call provincial [1] synods. The deans of cathedrals are to take care that every thing within their jurisdiction be carefully managed, and not without leave of the bishop to be non-resident. Thrice in the week, the prebendaries, or their deputies, are to expound some portion of the Scriptures.

The twenty-first title bestows a single chapter on the duties of churchwardens, a second on distinguishing the boundaries of parishes, and ten more on cathedral schools, the qualifications of the master, and the admission of the scholars.

[1] These, Burnet thinks, were to be composed only of the bishops of their provinces. Hist. Ref. iii. ann. 1553.

The twenty-second relates entirely to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and directs that the governors of colleges thenceforward should be priests; allows upon insufficiency of the annual income, or any extraordinary necessity, a diminution of the number of students in any faculty, except that of theology; forbids those who have the cure of souls to remain in college; grants to them, if they were fellows, however, the income of a year, the year of grace, (as this custom, now existing in the colleges both at Oxford and Cambridge, is called;) and finally proffers assistance to poorer academics, especially if they studied divinity.

Tithes, and exemptions from the payment of them, are the subject of the twenty-third title; visitations, of the twenty-fourth.

Married women; slaves; children under fourteen years of age; persons of unsound mind, unless in their lucid intervals; the deaf and dumb, unless it is sufficiently proved that by signs they can intelligibly express their minds; they who wrote libels to destroy the credit of their neighbours; the strumpet, and the pander; he who refused to part with his concubine, till death appeared to threaten the separation; heretics, and they who were sentenced to death, or to perpetual banishment or imprisonment; and, lastly, usurers; are all in the twenty-fifth

title of this code, debarred from the privilege of making a will. Yet, though not allowed the customary freedom of a testament, several of these persons might bequeath money to discharge the prisoner for debt; or to relieve the orphan, or widow, or any that had no helper; or to furnish the indigent maiden with a marriage-portion; or to maintain a scholar in one of our Universities; or to repair the highways.

The twenty-sixth title prescribes ecclesiastical censures. On extraordinary occasions, commutation of penance for money is allowed, the money being then bestowed upon the poor of the place, in which the offender lived. On the offender's relapse into transgression, the torturing hour of the penance itself is to be endured without remission.

The twenty-seventh, and the two following, dilate upon suspension, sequestration, and deprivation: the thirtieth, largely, upon excommunication; which, as it is asserted to cut off the offender from Christian society, is to be inflicted only in cases of extremity, where the crime makes a breach in morality, or strikes at the root of religion. Never ought this rigorous expedient to be used, says Collier, except when persons are hardened in their wickedness, that is, when they either make a jest of reproof, take no notice of a citation, or refuse to stand to the judgment of the

ecclesiastical court. The manner of restoring the penitent offender to the privileges he had lost concludes the chapter.

The regulations of the ecclesiastical courts are the subjects of the remaining titles; defining judgment, the office of the judge, crimes, quarrels, scandal, proofs, presumptions, witnesses, perjury, delays, exceptions, and appeals; in the midst of which are two chapters relating to the personal safety of the clergy.

Such is the unauthoritative code, often [1] altered, it appears, in its progress through the reigns of Henry and Edward; in vain [2] endeavoured to be brought into use in that of Elizabeth; merely reprinted in that of Charles the first; and, lastly, ineffectually [3] suggested to public notice with a view to its establishment by bishop Burnet.

[1] Strype had seen the first copy of it, with Cranmer's own amendments, and with those which long afterwards Peter Martyr made. Life of Cranm. B. i. ch. 30.

[2] See before, p. 329.

[3] History of his Own Times, at the Conclusion.

CHAPTER XIV.

1552 to 1553.

The archbishop in commission to enquire after certain sectaries —The Family of Love—The archbishop in another commission, relating to ecclesiastical goods—Avoids acting in it—His letter respecting it to Cecil—Their intimacy—The declining health of the king—Alteration of the succession in favour of lady Jane Grey—The archbishop's share in the transaction—The king dies—The lady Jane's brief reign.

THE autumn of 1552, we have seen, witnessed Cranmer in his residence at [1] Ford, near Canterbury. At the close of September, the Council had directed a letter to him there, for the purpose of examining a sect [2] newly sprung up in the county. Of this sect, neither the name, nor character, is recorded. All that appears is, that the archbishop was required to prevent the dissemination of its tenets, whatever they were. It could not be that of the Anabaptists, says Strype; for against them a commission, still in force, had been issued some years before. It was, perhaps, he adds, a branch

[1] See before, p. 289.

[2] Council-Book. Strype.

of the Family of Love, or "[1] the sect of David George, who made himself sometimes Christ, and sometimes the Holy Ghost." But it was Henry Nicholas, the constant companion of that enthusiast, who was the founder of this Family. The doctrine of George and Nicholas, however, was much the same; though the title of their disciples, first in Holland, the native country of[2] both the teachers, was not known before 1555, or 1556, when the former died. But the principles of the sect had probably been introduced into England, before that time; as the following passage in a treatise by Becon, the learned chaplain of Cranmer, seems to prove: "[3] What wicked and ungodly opinions are there sown now-days of the Anabaptists, *Davidians*, Libertines, and such other pestilent sects in the hearts of the people, to the great disquietness of Christ's Church, moving rather to sedition than to pure religion, to heresy than to things godly!" It is related also in the Displaying of the Family of Love, that "[4] there had been many

[1] Strype.

[2] Mosheim inaccurately describes Nicholas as a Westphalian. He was a native of Amsterdam, and was usually called *Henry of Amsterdam*. Displaying of the secte, &c. 1579, sign. A. iiij.

[3] Strype.

[4] A Displaying of the horrible secte of grosse and wicked heretiques, naming themselves, The Family of Love, set forth by J. R. (John Rogers,) 1579, sign. A. iii. b.

of our Englishmen, in Flanders, to confer with this Henry Nicholas, their author, of whom, in their return, they speak great good of his wisdom, of his mild nature, of his humility, and of his patience; yea, and they vainly boast that he knew of their secret messages, which they account to be miraculous." His directions for belonging to this Family, it is curious to observe, were these: "[1] They must pass four most terrible castles, full of cumbersome enemies, before they come to the house of love; the first is, of John Calvin, the second the Papists, the third Martin Luther, the fourth the Anabaptists; and, passing these dangers, they may be of the Family, else not." That is, other theological tenets than his own he considered of no moment. Of these several were blasphemous as well as absurd; and it is no wonder that his pretensions led his followers into laxity of morals. If we find no other allusion to this sect, or at least none of any importance, in the present or succeeding reign, our ecclesiastical history in that of Elizabeth describes it as then widely prevailing, and occasioning no small confusion in the kingdom.

To a business of political inquiry also the archbishop was commissioned, before he left his Kentish retirement. It was to ascertain who they were that had embezzled the plate and goods be-

[1] Displaying of the secte, &c. A. iiij. b.

longing to churches and chantries, which had been given to the king, and which they had converted to their own use. He has been [1] described as slow to enter upon this business, because he thought that whatever the inquiry of himself and other commissioners might recover, would pass, not into the hands of his sovereign, but into those of the rapacious duke of Northumberland and his friends. He was [2] charged as neglecting the royal order. He foresaw the further spoliation of church property now intended. Instead of remonstrating zealously and publicly, however, as he [3] had done at the beginning of Edward's reign, against the disposal of the chantries and religious houses; instead of now offering to combat with the duke, as upon this very point he has been [4] represented in the height of his indignation then challenging him; he cautiously excuses himself, as Cecil appears to have advised him, in stating to the duke the absence of those who were appointed to be his fellow-commissioners. Thus he wrote to Cecil.

[1] Strype. [2] Ibid. [3] See before, p. 33.

[4] Ralph Morice, Cranmer's secretary, relating the *stoutness* of the archbishop in any weighty matter concerning God or his prince, exemplifies it "in his *offering to combat with the duke, speaking then, on behalf of his prince, for the staying of the chantries, till his Highness had come unto lawful age.*" Strype. So Abp. Parker writes of Cranmer, "*ad duellum provocaret.*" Ant. Brit. 341.

"[1] After my very hearty recommendations, and no less thanks for your friendly letters and advertisements, be you assured that I take the same in such part, and to proceed of such a friendly mind, as I have ever looked for at your hands. Whereof I shall not be unmindful, if occasion hereafter shall serve to requite the same.

"I have written letters unto my lord of Northumberland, declaring unto him the cause of my stay in the commission; which is, because that all the gentlemen and justices of the peace in Kent, which be in commission with me, be now in London; before whose coming home, if I should proceed without them, I might perchance travel in vain, and take more pains than I should do good. I have written also unto him in the favour of [2] Michael Angelo, whose cause I pray you to help so much as lieth in you.

"The [3] Sophi and the Turk, the emperor and the French king, (not much better in religion than they,) rolling the stone, or turning the wheel of fortune up and down, I pray God send us peace and quietness with all realms, as well as among ourselves, and to preserve the king's Ma-

[1] Strype's Append. No. 107.

[2] The minister of the Italian Protestant Church in London.

[3] Alluding to the contests then existing between the emperors of Persia and the Turks, between Charles V. of Germany and Henry II. of France.

jesty with all his Council. Thus fare you well. From my house of Ford, the xx. day of November, 1552.

" Your assured,

" T. CANTUAR.

The intimacy of Cranmer with Cecil, (so strongly indeed expressed in the preceding letter,) has been considered, from the disparity of their ages, as reflecting no small credit on the latter, Cranmer being the elder by thirty-one years. " [1] The particular communications between them," the biographer of Cecil justly adds, " during the last moments of the king's short life, especially such as took place while the progress lasted, plainly point out the anxiety with which Cecil, as well as Cranmer, beheld the proceedings of Northumberland, and such persons as the latter had placed about the king. It is not, indeed, certain that Cecil was free from apprehensions of the king's personal safety, as well as Cranmer, since in one of the letters of the latter to the secretary, after thanking him for his communications generally, he adds, [2] *but especially that you advertise me that the king's Majesty is in good health; wherein I beseech God long to continue his Highness:* and after entreating Cecil in another

[1] Life of Lord Burghley, by Dr. Nares, vol. i. 391.

[2] Strype, Life of Cranm. B. 2. ch. 30.

letter, and upon some alteration of the king's route, to inform him of all such changes, that he might, from time to time, know where his Majesty was, he concludes with his usual earnest prayer, [1] *that God would preserve and prosper him.*"

Edward had now long suffered under declining health; and the commission, which we have just noticed, as well as his authority for the Catechism and Articles, were signed, when it was evident that beyond a few weeks his life could not last. It was at this time too, that Northumberland married his fourth son, lord Guildford Dudley, to the lady Jane Grey, daughter of the duke of Suffolk, and grand-daughter of Mary, sister to Henry VIII., under the hope of excluding from the throne, after Edward's death, both Mary and Elizabeth, upon the plea of unrepealed illegitimacy; and of placing the crown upon the head of his son's wife. To this project he obtained the consent of the dying sovereign. The insidious statesman is described by Godwin, as suggesting to his royal master the danger, in which the Church would be, if he appointed not a successor who would maintain the established religion. [2] How the lady Mary stood affected, he said, was well known. Of the lady Elizabeth there might, perhaps, be better hopes. But their cases were

[1] Strype.

[2] Godwin, Ann. 1630, p. 255. And Lansdowne MSS. No. 198, p. 11.

so similar, that either both must be excluded, or the former be admitted. Of a religious and good prince it was the duty not to regard the regular lineage, where the glory of God and the good of his subjects might be endangered; nor could he be able, if he acted otherwise, to answer it before God. The three daughters of the duke of Suffolk, after his royal sisters, were the next of kin to him. Their virtues, as well as their birth, commended them. From them neither the violation of religion, nor the danger of a foreign yoke by any match, was to be feared. They had been educated in that faith and worship which his Majesty had happily established, and were united to husbands as zealous Protestants as themselves. These he would advise to be named successively as heirs to the throne.

So spake the false [1] dissembler; and the instrument of succession was accordingly prepared. The lady Frances, the mother of Jane Grey, was at first intended by Edward as his successor. But the transfer of the right to her eldest daughter, though right it cannot be called, was readily made. The way for the young queen was thus illegally secured, not without a moral violation in those whom Northumberland induced to

[1] At his death he professed himself a Roman Catholic, but "indeed he was known, in Edward's reign, to have no other religion than interest." Lingard, Hist. Eng. 8vo. vii. 175.

sanction it; most of whom had sworn to preserve the order of succession directed by the will of Henry. Cranmer in vain opposed it. He argued repeatedly, but ineffectually, with his young sovereign, in the presence of others, against a proceeding so ill-advised and so illegal. He desired to converse with him indeed alone, and said afterwards, we shall find, that if this had been permitted, he had saved the king from his weakness, and Northumberland from his disgrace. Northumberland not only prevented such an interview, so honourable as the consequences of it might have been in giving a just direction to Edward's mind, and in preserving the firmness of Cranmer himself; but, [1] before the Council, with his accustomed haughtiness, exclaimed, that it became not the archbishop to speak to the king, even as he had already done, so as to dissuade him from the present purpose.

Cranmer at last gave his assent to this purpose; so reluctantly, however, as to elicit, even from his enemies, the admission that he was, as it were, compelled to it. Nor during the remaining days of obloquy and suffering, that soon were his, did they add to their reproaches his share in this transaction. The transaction is related by the recent historian of our country, with questioning the veracity of the archbishop's own

[1] Strype.

statement of it, which, however, neither while he lived, nor from that to the present time, has ever been before impugned. Dr. Lingard has suppressed what he ought to have published; has insinuated, where he might have been candid. We will hear them both.

"[1] Among the privy councillors," says the historian, "there were *some*, who, though apprised of the illegality and apprehensive of the consequences of the measure, *suffered themselves to be seduced by the threats and promises of Northumberland*, and their objection to the succession of a princess, who would probably re-establish the ancient faith, and compel them to restore the property which they had torn from the Church. The archbishop, *if we may believe his own statement*, had requested a private interview with the king, but he was accompanied by the marquess of Northampton and the lord Darcy, in whose presence Edward solicited him to subscribe the new settlement, expressed a hope that he would not refuse his sovereign a favour which had been granted by every other councillor, and assured him, that according to the decision of the judges, a king in actual possession had a power to limit the descent of the Crown after his decease. Cranmer confesses he had the weakness to yield against his own conviction, and that, having once

[1] Lingard, Hist. Eng. 8vo. edit. vii. 140.

yielded, he resolved to support the cause with all the influence of his station."

Cranmer had neither been won by the promises, nor awed by the threats, of Northumberland. He tells us plainly how he was over-ruled, in the letter which he afterwards addressed to Mary; and his statement, which, if it had not been entitled to entire belief, must have been immediately contradicted, thus materially alters the representation that has been cited. "[1] I ask mercy and pardon," he says, "for my heinous folly and offence in consenting to, and following, the testament and last will of our late sovereign lord, king Edward VI. your Grace's brother; which, well God he knoweth, I never liked, nor any thing grieved me so much that your Grace's brother did. And if by any means it had been in me to have letted the making of that will, I would have done it. And what I said therein, as well to the Council, as to himself, divers of your Majesty's Council can report: but none so well as the marquess of Northampton, and the lord Darcy, then lord-chamberlain to the king's Majesty, which two were present at the communication between the king's Majesty and me. I desired to talk with the king's Majesty alone, but I could not be suffered: and so I failed of my purpose. *For if I might have communed with the king alone,*

[1] From the Letters of the Martyrs. Strype, Append. No. 74.

and at good leisure, my trust was, that I should have altered him from his purpose; but, they being present, my labour was in vain.

" Then, when I could not dissuade him from the said will, and both he and his Privy Council also informed me, that the judges and his learned counsel said, that the Act of entailing the Crown, made by his father, could not be prejudicial to him; but that he being in possession of the Crown, might make his will thereof; this seemed very strange unto me. But being the sentence of the judges, and other his learned counsel in the laws of this realm, (as both he and his Council informed me) methought it became not me, being unlearned in the law, to stand against my prince therein. And so at length I was required by the king's Majesty himself to set my hand to his will; saying, that he trusted, that I alone would not be more repugnant to his will than the rest of the Council were. *Which words surely grieved my heart very sore:* and so I granted him to subscribe his will, and to follow the same. Which when I had set my hand unto, I did it unfeignedly and without dissimulation.

" For the which I submit myself most humbly unto your Majesty, acknowledging mine offence with most grievous and sorrowful heart, and beseeching your mercy and pardon; which my heart giveth me shall not be denied unto me, being granted before to so many, who travailed not so

much to dissuade both the king and his Council, as I did.

"And whereas it is contained in two Acts of Parliament, as I understand, that I, with the duke of Northumberland, should devise and compass the deprivation of your Majesty from your royal Crown, surely it is untrue. *For the duke never opened his mouth to me, to move me* [*to*] *any such matter. Nor his heart was not such toward me, (seeking long time my destruction,) that he would ever trust me in such a matter, or think that I would be persuaded by him.* It was other of the Council that moved me, and the king himself, the duke of Northumberland not being present. *Neither before, neither after, had I ever any privy communication with the duke of that matter, saving that openly, at the council-table, the duke said unto me, that it became not me to say to the king, as I did, when I went about to dissuade him from his said will.*"

After his disputation too at Oxford, imploring the lords of the Council to intercede for him with the queen, he says, "[1] *some of you know by what means I was brought and* [2] *trained unto the will of our late sovereign lord, king Edward VI., and what I spake against the same;* wherein

[1] His letter to the Council. Foxe.

[2] Drawn by p rsuasion, namely, of the king. Shakspeare and Milton, both use *train* in this sense.

I refer me to the reports of your honours and worships." And was this appeal to living witnesses answered by any confutation of the veracity of his statement? No, not even by a solitary witness, although in that Council were assembled some of his bitterest and acutest enemies. It remained for an historian of our own days to challenge it; but it is beyond his power to destroy it. In truth, the archbishop was well aware of the injustice, and seems to have expected the failure, of placing Jane upon the throne, although he wanted sufficient firmness altogether to reject the proposition.

The days of Edward now closed, not without the suspicion, Strype and others relate, that poison shortened them. But the letter of the Council, two days after his death, to Sir Philip Hoby, the ambassador at the court of the emperor Charles, describes the consumptive disease that overcame him. Cranmer probably wrote it. "[1] We must tell you," the writer says, "a great heap of infelicity;" (to none greater, indeed, than to Cranmer himself;) "God hath called out of this world our sovereign lord the sixth of this month, (July) towards night, whose manner of death was such towards God as assureth us that his soul is in place of eternal joy. The disease whereof he

[1] Cotton. MSS. Galba. B. xii. 240. b.

died was of the putrefaction of the lungs, being utterly uncurable."

The temporary accession of the lady Jane, and the ineffectual attempts of her partisans to prolong it, now followed. In vain did Cranmer and his fellow-councillors call upon Mary to recognise the sovereignty, which had been forced upon her young rival. In vain did he join the [1] decreased number of the lords, in calling upon others to remain firm in the allegiance which had been promised to Jane. Eleven days only witnessed the sceptre in her hands; the Council that had placed it in them then agreed to acknowledge, that they had placed it erroneously, and to Mary tendered their loyalty. The dethroned lady, and the misguided primate, we shall soon find within the walls of the same prison.

[1] Their number was now only sixteen; it had been twenty-four.

BOOK III.

CHAPTER I.

MARY.

1553.

The lady Jane committed to the Tower—Funeral of Edward—The archbishop reported to have restored the service of the mass—His public denial of the report—Summoned before the queen's commissioners and the Council—Committed to the Tower—Accused and declared guilty of high treason—His companions in prison, the lady Jane, Ridley, Bradford, and Latimer—Curious anecdote of the lady.

MARY was no sooner seated on the throne, than the lady Jane was committed a prisoner to the Tower. There, till more than a month after the ceremony of the former's coronation, the latter remained without a trial. Meantime Edward was buried, "[1] Mary suffering the archbishop to officiate," Dr. Lingard says, "according to the Protestant form at the funeral in Westminster Abbey, while a solemn dirge and high mass were chanted for him, at the same time, in the chapel

[1] Hist. Eng. 8vo. vii. 181.

of the Tower, in the presence of the [1] nobility and courtiers, to the number of three hundred persons." But there is no authority for the assertion which is, from [2] Burnet, that Cranmer thus officiated. Foxe would not have failed to record so memorable a circumstance. The chroniclers, Holinshed and Stow, are also silent respecting it. We must consider Day, at this time, restored by Mary to his bishopric, as Godwin relates it, as having performed the solemn service: "[3] The exequies of the king," says the old historian, "were celebrated, Day, bishop of Chichester, preaching, executing in English, and administering the sacrament, according to the manner and form received in the reign of Edward: for as yet, nothing had been determined concerning any change in point of religion." It had been reported indeed, of the archbishop, that he had offered not only to chant the mass and requiem at the royal funeral, but that, in his cathedral at Canterbury, he had already restored thus much of the Romish ritual. The mass certainly appears to have been now renewed in that church by the vice-dean of it, Dr. Thornden, who was also suffragan

[1] Stow relates only, that "the queen held an obsequy in the Tower for Edward, the dirge being sung in Latin; and on the morrow a mass of requiem, whereat the queen with her ladies offered." 1038.

[2] Strype with hesitation follows Burnet, Ecc. Mem. ii. 432.

[3] Annals, ed. 1630. 276.

bishop of Dover, whom Cranmer, hastening to refute the charges against himself, pronounces "a false, flattering, lying monk." The archbishop with a "boldness that does honour to his courage," but, "betrays by its asperity the bitterness of his feelings," as Dr. Lingard describes it, drew up a declaration, with a view to public use, in defence of the Reformation as well as himself. And who wonders at the "bitterness of his feelings," when he is unjustly charged with restoring what had cost him the labour of many years to abolish; and when he, whom he had trusted as his own familiar friend, (for Thornden had lived with him,) had dared to give occasion for the charge. This paper Cranmer submitted first to Scory, now deprived of the bishopric of Chichester, for the advantage of his private and friendly consideration. Scory indiscreetly gave copies of it, while as yet it was considered by Cranmer incomplete. Of these, one was read in Cheapside, and others were dispersed, but without the knowledge or consent, on the contrary, to the great mortification, of the archbishop. Some of these copies were brought to the lords of the Council, by whom, when he was asked if he was the author of the declaration, he answered,[1] *that certainly he was;* but that he was very sorry to

[1] It has been supposed by some, that, "the intemperance of the style bespeaks the hand of Peter Martyr, rather than of Cranmer himself." Martyr, who was now resident with the

find the paper had gone from him in such a manner, as he had resolved to enlarge it in many respects, and to affix it, with his hand and seal to it, to the doors of the churches in London. As it was, the following copy has been preserved.

" [1] *A Declaration of the reverend father in God, Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, condemning the untrue and slanderous report of some which have reported, that he should set up the mass at Canterbury, at the first coming of the queen to her reign,* 1553.

" As the devil, Christ's ancient adversary, is a liar, and the father of lying; even so hath he stirred his servants and members to persecute Christ, and his true word and religion: which he ceaseth not to do most earnestly at this present. For whereas the most noble prince of famous memory, king Henry VIII. seeing the great abuses of the Latin masses, reformed something herein in his time; and also our late sovereign lord king Edward VI., took the same whole away for the manifold errors and abuses thereof, and restored in the place thereof Christ's Holy Supper, according to Christ's own institution, and as the apostles in the Primitive Church used the same

archbishop, at Lambeth, prompted him, most probably, to this kind of defence. But we are to remember, not only the manners of the times, but also that some of the strong terms, which here are used, are taken from the Scriptures.

[1] Foxe. Burnet. Strype.

in the beginning. The devil goeth about by lying to overthrow the Lord's Holy Supper, and to restore the Latin satisfactory masses, a thing of his own invention and device. And to bring the same more easily to pass, some have abused the name of me, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, bruiting abroad, that I have set up the mass at Canterbury, and that I offered to say mass before the queen's Highness, and at Paul's church, and I wot not where. I have been well exercised these twenty years, to suffer and bear evil reports and lies; and have not been much grieved thereat, and have borne all things quietly. Yet when untrue reports and lies turn to the hindrance of God's truth, they be in no wise to be tolerated and suffered. Wherefore these be to signify to the world, that it was not I that did set up the mass at Canterbury, but it was a false, flattering, lying, and dissembling monk which caused the mass to be set up there, without my advice or counsel.

" And as for offering myself to say mass bef the queen's Highness, or in any other place, I never did, as her Grace knoweth well. But if her Grace will give me leave, I shall be ready to prove against all that will say the contrary; and that the Communion-Book, set forth by the most innocent and godly prince, king Edward VI., in his high court of parliament, is conformable to the order which our Saviour Christ did both observe and command to be observed, and which

his Apostles and Primitive Church used many years. Whereas the mass, in many things, not only hath no foundation of Christ, his Apostles, nor the Primitive Church, but also is manifestly contrary to the same; and containeth many horrible blasphemies in it. And although many, either unlearned, or maliciously, do report, that Mr. Peter Martyr is [1] unlearned; yet if the queen's Highness will grant thereunto, I, with the said Mr. Peter Martyr, and other four or five which I shall choose, will, by God's grace, [2] take upon us to defend, that not only our Common Prayers of the churches, ministration of the sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies, but also that all the doctrine and religion, by our said sovereign lord king Edward VI., is more pure, and according to God's Word, than any that hath been used in England these thousand years; so that God's Word may be the judge, and that the reason and proofs may be set out in writing. To the intent as well all the world may examine and judge them, as that no man shall start back from their writing. And what faith hath been in the Church these fifteen hundred years, we will join with them in this point; and that the doctrine and usage is to be followed, which was in

[1] See Cranmer's defence of Martyr's learning before, p. 213.

[2] Hammond notices, with approbation, this challenge in defence of our excellent liturgy. Works, vol. i. 366.

the Church fifteen hundred years past. And we shall prove, that the Order of the Church, set out at this present in this Church of England by Act of parliament, is the same that was used in the Church fifteen hundred years past. And so shall they never be able to prove theirs."

While this manifesto was in circulation, Cranmer was summoned to appear before the queen's commissioners, and to bring with him an inventory of his goods. He had already appeared before the Council. On both occasions his share in the usurpation of the lady Jane was the [1] cause. The first was at the beginning of August, when he was ordered not to depart from his palace, and to be forth-coming when called. To Cecil, who was also a partner in the usurpation, but was at liberty, he now wrote, requesting from him a visit to Lambeth, that he might converse with him upon a subject of such deep concern to his friends, as well as himself.

" [2] After my very hearty recommendations; yesternight I heard reported, that Mr. Cheke is indicted. I pray you heartily, if you know any thing thereof, to send me knowledge, and where-

[1] Strype supposes that the commissioners intended now "to lay to his charge heresy and his marriage." It was too early, Henry Wharton rightly observes, to object to him either.

[2] Strype, Append. No. 109.

upon he is indicted. I had great trust that he should be one of them that should feel the queen's great mercy and pardon, as one who hath been none of *the great doers in this matter against her;* and my trust is not yet gone, *except it be for his earnestness in religion;* for the which, if he suffer, blessed is he of God that suffereth for His sake, howsoever the world judge of him. For what ought we to care for the judgment of the world, when God absolveth us? But alas, if any means could be made for him, or for my lord Russel, it were not to be omitted, nor in any wise neglected. But I am utterly destitute both of counsel in this matter, and of power, being in the same condemnation that they be.

"But that only thing, which I can do, I shall not cease to do; and that is, only to pray for them, and for myself, with all others that be now in adversity. When I saw you at the Court, I would fain have talked with you; but I durst not. Nevertheless, if you could find a time to come over to me, I would gladly commune with you. Thus fare you heartily well, with my lady your wife. From Lambeth, this 14th day of this month of August, [1553.]

"Your own assured,

"T. CANTUAR."

Cranmer would not talk with Cecil, Strype supposes, in the presence of the Court, or Council,

lest it might impede the grant of pardon which the statesman now expected. And, indeed, Cecil played most dexterously for it. He "[1] misliked the matter," he says, "when he first heard it secretly" proposed. He *intended* "to stand against the matter," he continues, "as Mr. Petre and Mr. Cheke are witnesses." He "refused to be at the drawing of the proclamation," he proceeds, "for the publishing of the usurper's title, and eschewed the writing of Mary *bastard*." He "determined to flee from the rest of Jane's Council, if the consultation had not taken effect, as Mr. Petre can tell, who [2] meant the like." He "proposed to have stolen down to the queen's Highness, and had his horses ready *at Lambeth* for the purpose." Not to mention his other adroit apologies, I will add only the twenty-first as a very curious one: "When this conspiracy was first opened to me, I did fully set me to flee the realm, and was dissuaded by Mr. Cheke, who willed me for my satisfaction, to read a dialogue of Plato, where Socrates, being in prison, was offered to escape and flee, and yet he would not. *I read the dialogue, whose reasons did indeed stay me.*" He solicited pardon, therefore, as

[1] Lansdowne MSS. 104. fol. 1. Entitled by Cecil, "A brief note of my submission and declaration of my doings."

[2] And yet Petre subscribed his name to the second order of Jane's Council for maintaining allegiance to her. Cecil certainly did not, although he did to the first.

"differing from others that had more plainly offended," as "differing from them whom he served;" and he obtained it. The similar plea of Cranmer was in [1] mockery, we shall presently find, not disregarded.

As yet we behold the archbishop confined only to the precincts of his own palace; and he might have followed the earnest advice of his friends to fly, as others now had fled, from the persecutions at hand. He nobly resolved not to desert his post. "[2] Were I accused," said he to those who were anxious for his safety, "of theft, parricide, or some other crime, although I were innocent, I might, peradventure, be induced so to shift for myself; but being questioned for my allegiance not to men, but to God, the truth of whose Holy Word is to be asserted against the errors of popery, I have, at this time, with a constancy befitting a Christian prelate, resolved rather to leave my life than the kingdom." Others, however, he entreated to follow the counsel which himself had declined; and to one of them thus urged his arguments.

"[3] The true comforter in all distress is only

[1] By pardoning him for the treason, only in order to burn him for alleged heresy.

[2] Godwin, Ann. 1630, p. 280.

[3] Strype from Foxe.

God, through his Son Jesus Christ. And whosoever hath Him, hath company enough, although he were in a wilderness all alone. And he that hath twenty thousand in his company, if God be absent, is in a miserable wilderness and desolation. In Him is all comfort, and without Him is none. Wherefore I beseech you, seek your dwelling there, where you may truly and rightly serve God, and dwell in Him, and have Him ever dwelling in you. What can be so heavy a burden as an unquiet conscience, to be in such a place as a man cannot be suffered to serve God in Christ's religion? If you be loth to depart from your kin and friends, remember, that Christ calleth them his mother, sisters, and brothers, that do his Father's will. Where we find, therefore, God truly honoured according to His will, there we can lack neither friend nor kin.

"If you be loth to depart for slandering God's Word, remember, that Christ, when his hour was not yet come, departed out of his country into Samaria, to avoid the malice of the Scribes and Pharisees; and commanded his Apostles, that if they were pursued in one place, they should fly to another. And was not Paul let down by a basket out at a window, to avoid the persecution of Aretas? And what wisdom and policy he used, from time to time, to escape the malice of his enemies, the Acts of the Apostles do declare. And after the same sort did the other Apostles.

Albeit, when it came to such a point, that they could no longer escape danger of the persecutors of God's true religion, then they shewed themselves, that their flying before came not of fear, but of godly wisdom, to do more good, and that they would not rashly, without urgent necessity, offer themselves to death; which had been but a temptation of God. Yea, when they were apprehended, and could no longer avoid, then they stood boldly to the profession of Christ; then they shewed how little they passed of death; how much they feared God more than men; how much they loved, and preferred, the eternal life to come above this short and miserable life.

"Wherefore I exhort you, as well by Christ's commandment as by the example of him and his Apostles, to withdraw yourself, from the malice of your's and God's enemies, into some place where God is most purely served. Which is no slandering of the truth, but a preserving of yourself to God and the truth, and to the society and comfort of Christ's little flock. And that you will do, do it with speed, lest by your own folly you fall into the persecutors' hands. And the Lord send His Holy Spirit to lead and guide you, wheresoever you go. And all that be godly will say, Amen."

By the settlement of his own affairs, and the payment of all his debts, the archbishop prepared

himself for the worst even with cheerfulness, exclaiming, says Foxe, *that he was now his own man, and with the help of God was ready to meet any adversity.* His resolution had no sooner been formed, than he was a [1] second time brought before the lords of the Council, who sent him to the Tower, " [2] as well for the treason committed by him against the queen's Majesty, as for aggravating of the same his offence, by spreading about seditious bills, moving tumults to the disquietness of the present State." And yet not a single bill, or declaration, is Cranmer known to have dispersed. To the injudicious zeal of his friend the alleged mischief is to be attributed. At the [3] close of the Latin version of the declaration by Valeran Pullan, published in 1554, the surreptitious circulation of it is rightly stated.

However, the archbishop was now entirely deprived of his liberty; yet till the thirteenth of November, when he was escorted from the Tower with the lady Jane and her husband, to a public [4] trial, he was not adjudged guilty of the treason. But as others more deeply implicated in the accu-

[1] On the 8th of September. Council-Book. Archæol. vol. xviii.

[2] Council-Book.

[3] Viz. sign. d. 7. b. " Lecta publicè Londini in vico mercatorum *ab amico, qui clàm autographum surripuerat*, 5 Sept. Anno Dom. 1553." See also Burnet, ii. Rec. p. 250.

[4] See what John à Lasco has said of Cranmer's trial in the present vol. p. 204.

sation of adherence to Jane had already been pardoned, to him also was afterwards forgiven the crime of a traitor, while for that of a heretic it was determined that still he should suffer. He was now remanded, with the young couple, to the prison; and though Jane, on her return, was forbidden by the savage cruelty of Mary to see again her husband, (before the last day of their lives,) convicted like herself; it does not appear that the archbishop was prohibited from visiting her. It should seem rather, by a letter to the lieutenant of the Tower, that they were allowed to meet. That officer was "[1] to suffer the late duke of Northumberland's children to have the liberty of walking within the garden of the Tower; and also to minister *the like favours to the lady Jane and doctor Cranmer.*" The archbishop, no doubt, would strengthen her resistance to the frequent efforts which Mary made to convert her to the Romish faith; a resistance indeed, which from the beginning of her confinement seems to have been her inviolable determination, as we learn from a conference between herself and a visitor in the house of the warder of the Tower, (whose name was Partridge,) in which she was lodged; part of which I copy as an interesting relic. "[2] On Tuesday,

[1] Council-Book, ut supr.

[2] The Primitive Practice for preserving Truth, or, An Historical Narration, &c. by Sir Simonds D'Ewes, Lond. 1645, p. 13, where he cites the above, and more, from a manuscript history of queen Mary's time.

the 29th of August," says the visitor, "I dined at Partridge's house with my lady Jane. After that we fell in discourse of matters of religion." She adverted to "the sudden conversion of the late duke [of Northumberland,] saying, who would have thought he would have so done? It was answered her, perchance he thereby [1] hoped to have had his pardon." She replied, "who can judge that he should hope for pardon, whose life was odious to all men? Like as his life was wicked and full of dissimulation, so was his end thereafter: I pray God that neither I, nor any friend of mine, die so. *Should I who am young, and in the flower of my years, forsake my faith for love of life? Nay, God forbid.* Much more he should not, whose fatal course, although he had lived his just number of years, could not have long continued."

The lady Jane found Ridley and Latimer, as well as Cranmer, the supporters of her perilous elevation. Their preaching in favour of her sovereignty, the Council of Mary considered as sufficient ground for sending them to prison; whence they were led to be questioned, we shall presently find, not for that offence, but upon a charge of heresy, in order that they might be brought to the stake. Ridley's committal had

[1] See also bishop Godwin, Ann. 278. And the note respecting the duke before, in this vol. p. 357.

[1] preceded that of Cranmer several weeks. Bradford, another of the Marian martyrs, had been [2] soon after him conducted to the same confinement: Latimer, who was summoned from the country, [3] five days after Cranmer. With other victims this prison was soon crowded; and the four arrested Protestants, to each of whom, at the first, a separate apartment was allotted, were now placed together in a single room. Latimer forbore not to remind the queen's commissioners, at Oxford, of the circumstance as productive of consolation, though apparently intended as a slight, to them. "[4] Mr. Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury," said he, "Mr. Ridley, bishop of London, that holy man Mr. Bradford, and I, old Hugh Latimer, were imprisoned in the Tower of London for Christ's Gospel preaching; and for because *we would not go a* [5] *massing*, every one

[1] July 26. [2] Aug. 14. [3] Sept. 13.

[4] Protestation of Mr. Hugh Latimer rendered in writing to Dr. Weston, and others of the queen's commissioners, &c. April 20, 1554. Faithfully translated out of Latin int English. Strype, Ecc. Mem. iii. 92.

[5] Ridley is supposed to have been treated with more indulgence than other prisoners in the Tower. This was probably soon after his committal to it. And it is said to have been granted, to see whether he would voluntarily be present at the mass or not. Foxe relates, that he was once there; but upon Bradford's writing to him what offence might thus be given, he went no more. Dr. Lingard fails not to adorn the old narrative: "There (in the Tower) Ridley *had the weakness to be-*

in close prison from other, the same Tower being so full of other prisoners, *we four were thrust into one chamber, as men not to be accounted of.* But,

tray his conscience by conforming to the ancient worship: but *his apostacy* was severely lashed by the pen of Bradford; and Ridley, by his speedy repentance and subsequent resolution, consoled and edified his afflicted brethren!" Hist. Eng. 8vo. vii. 269. Then let us hear Ridley himself upon this very point; in a conference, too, with Latimer, and in the very precincts in which he is said to have "betrayed his conscience," while both of them were prisoners. It is objected as if by bishop Gardiner to Ridley, "all men marvel greatly, why you, after the liberty which you have granted unto you more than the rest, *do not go to mass*, which is a thing, as you know, much esteemed of all men, yea of the queen herself:—What is it that offendeth you so greatly in the mass, that you *will not vouchsafe once either to hear or see it?* From whence cometh this new religion upon you? Have not you used in times past to say mass yourself? *M. Ridley's Answer.* I confess unto you my fault and ignorance; but know you that for these matters I have done penance *long ago*, both at Paul's Cross, and also openly in the pulpit at Cambridge, and I trust God hath forgiven me this mine offence; for I did it upon ignorance. But if you be desirous to know, and will vouchsafe to hear, what things offend me in the mass, I will rehearse unto you those things which be most clear, and seem to repugn most manifestly against God's Word; and they be these, the strange tongue, the want of shewing of the Lord's death, &c." Dr. Ridley, the biographer of the martyr, argues from this narrative of Foxe, that, in regard to the story of Bradford, the martyrologist had been misinformed. Life, &c. p. 434. Dr. Wordsworth agrees with the biographer, and observes in addition, that Foxe relates precisely the same particulars respecting Bradford and bishop Farrar. Ecc. Biog. iii. 322.

God be thanked, to our great joy and comfort, there did we together read over the New Testament with great deliberation, and painful study; and I assure you, as I will answer before the tribunal of God's Majesty, we could find, in the Testament, of Christ's body and blood none other presence but a spiritual presence, nor that the mass was any sacrifice for sin. But in that Heavenly Book it appeared, that the sacrifice, which Christ Jesus our Redeemer did upon the cross, was perfect, holy, and good; that God the Heavenly Father did require none other, nor that ever again to be done."

CHAPTER II.

1553 to 1554.

Mary's promise as to religion—Restoration of the Romish service—Gardiner chancellor of Cambridge—Mary's letter to him—Reformed clergy silenced—Hooper and Coverdale sent to prison—P. Martyr and other Reformers leave the kingdom—Mary's first parliament—The divorce of her mother set aside—The shamelessness of Gardiner in accusing Cranmer as to that divorce—A convocation—Disputes on the corporal presence—Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, sent to Oxford, there to dispute on the same subject—Cranmer's letter relating to the disputation.

THE service established in the reign of Edward, it has been already observed, did not immediately cease on the accession of Mary. In a speech to the lord mayor of London, in the early part of August, she said, that "[1] she meaned graciously not to compel or strain other men's consciences, otherwise than God should, as she trusted, put in their hearts a persuasion of the truth through the opening of His Word unto them." But on the eighteenth of that month,

[1] Council-Book. Archæol. xviii. 173.

she published a proclamation, in which the artful repetition of this concession is followed by the words, "[1] *until such time as further order, by common consent, may be taken therein.*" That they should not be molested in the exercise of their religion, the Protestants of Suffolk at the opening of her reign, are said to have been also by her royal word assured. Foxe first related this account. Dr. Lingard has been pleased to [2] deny his authority; and Mr. Butler follows him, with a compliment to his research, in "[3] having *sufficiently* shewn that no such promise was made," and in referring, by way of corroboration, to her address to the men of Suffolk in July, which contains no such promise, but which, indeed, is nothing more than a brief notification that Edward was dead, that herself was queen, and that she had not fled the realm, as some had surmised. It is the statement of Foxe alone, which both these learned writers, therefore, have impugned. They might have turned to other authorities, which perhaps their ingenuity may fail to silence. He, who with Cranmer had been led to espouse the cause of the lady Jane, but now was meditating to be active in that of Mary, the earl of Arundel, thus addressed some of his fellow-councillors: "[4] How doth it appear, that Mary intends

[1] Wilkin's, Council. iv. 86.

[2] Hist. Eng. 8vo. vii. 493.

[3] Book of the Rom. Cath. Church, 1825, p. 210.

[4] Godwin, Annals, ed. 1630, p. 270.

any alteration in religion? Certainly, *having been lately petitioned unto this point by the Suffolk men, she gave them* (and that was true) *a very hopeful answer.*" The words *and that was true* are the assertion of bishop Godwin himself. Another writer, still nearer to the time than Godwin, bids Protestants "[1] remember the policies of Charles used with [2] Maurice and others, *for assurance of religion,* against the confederates of Smalcald. Let them remember *the Fremlingham* (the Suffolk) promises for not altering religion." Sir Simonds D'Ewes, one of our most learned and accurate antiquaries, in Charles the First's reign, would hardly have asserted, if he had not been convinced of its truth, what follows. "[3] Mary entered her reign," he writes, "with the breach of her public faith. For whereas the crown was set on her head, by the gentry and commons of Suffolk, although they knew her to be a papist;—yet she in one of her first acts of Council, took order for their restraint, long before the mass and Latin service were generally received in London itself, and caused that diocese to taste the sharpest inquisition and persecution that raged during her

[1] Norton's Warning against the dangerous practices of Papists, &c. s. d. temp. Eliz. sign. N. iij.

[2] See before, what Cranmer says of Maurice, in the present volume, p. 279.

[3] The Primitive Practice for preserving Truth, or, an Historical Narration, &c. By Sir Simonds D'Ewes, 1645, p. 29.

reign, which was happily shortened by her husband's contemning her person, and her enemies conquering her dominions; neither of which she ever had power to revenge, or recover; so, as though the cause of her death proceeded from no outward violence, yet was her end as inglorious and miserable, as her reign had been turbulent and bloody."

But it was not till near the close of the year, that the restoration of the Romish service was declared by an Act of Parliament; "[1] by which was at once rased to the ground," so Dr. Lingard writes, "that fabric which the ingenuity and perseverance of archbishop Cranmer had erected in the last reign." The historian might have added, that soon was the goodly fabric re-edified, and from the days of Mary's successor has stood the admiration of other Protestant countries, the pride and support of its own; for "[2] liberty constitutes the foundation of all the greatness of Britain, and the source of her liberty was the Reformation."

Gardiner had now succeeded the duke of Northumberland as chancellor of the University of Cambridge. Two days[3] only had passed since this exaltation, when Mary[4] directed him to revive,

[1] Hist. Eng. 8vo. vii. 192.

[2] Mackray's Essay on the Effect of the Reformation on Civil Society in Europe, 1829. p. 67.

[3] The duke was beheaded Aug. 18, 1553.

[4] Aug. 20. Ellis, Orig. Lett. second ser. ii. 246.

among the students of Cambridge, the ancient worship and ceremonies, "[1] wishing the examples," of her intention to abrogate the religion established by Edward, "first to begin in the Universities." Three days [2] afterwards the kingdom also beheld Gardiner its chancellor. To him was granted in the following week a commission to license, under the great seal such preachers only, as he should judge of sufficient gravity, and discretion, to promote the views of his sovereign and himself. The reformed clergy were thus to be silenced. By Gardiner they could not expect their ministry to be tolerated. Many of them, therefore, read to their congregations the Common Prayer only, which as yet was not prohibited; others gave instruction in private conferences; and some considered themselves still at liberty by law, as well as obliged in conscience, to continue their public discourses. The authority of Gardiner was considered to be thus disobeyed. Several distinguished prelates and clergy were accordingly cited to appear before the Council. Hooper, afterwards the martyr, was immediately committed to the Fleet prison. Coverdale was [3] long detained, but soon deprived of the see of Exeter. And Latimer, we have seen, was sent, as soon as he

[1] Ellis, 245. Aug. 23. Stow.

[2] He was allowed to depart to Denmark, Feb. 19, 1554. Council-Book. Archæol. He had been deprived of his bishopric in Sept. 1553. Le Neve.

had reached London, to the Tower. By the Reformers safety was now to be sought in flight. Strype reckons the ecclesiastical emigrants eight hundred; those of rank, (among whom soon afterwards was the duchess of Suffolk, the queen's cousin,) merchants, tradesmen, and others, [1] many hundreds. They betook themselves chiefly to Frankfort, Embden, Zurich, Antwerp, Strasburg, and Geneva. Foreign Protestants, that were now in England, were suffered quietly to depart. Peter Martyr, however, the friend of Cranmer, yet lingered in London, after the archbishop had been imprisoned, under the deepest anxiety for the issue. When Edward died, the learned Florentine had been immediately confined to his house in Oxford; but was soon permitted to visit London, having relinquished his professorship. Upon his departure from the University, "[2] many scholars left it, and went beyond the seas." Himself repaired to Lambeth Palace, where he found the sanctuary only of a few days. The fate of his patron had nearly been his own. It was [3] long argued by Mary's Council, whether, as he had written and acted so vigorously against the doctrines of the Church of Rome, it were fit that he should be proceeded against as a heretic. But it

[1] Chiliades. Pref. to the Latin translation of Cranmer's Defence. Strype.

[2] A. Wood, Annals Univ. Ox. under the year 1554.

[3] Godwin, Ann. 1630. 281.

was determined, that as he came to England upon public encouragement, and under public protection, he was at liberty to depart with his family. His wife had died at Oxford not long before he left it, and was buried in the cathedral of Christ Church; yet, ere the reign of Mary closed, her [1] remains, as being those of a pretended heretic, were disinterred and thrown into a dung-hill, but again were honourably consigned to the tomb, which had been violated, by the direction of archbishop Parker, when Elizabeth was queen. Ochin is [2] said to have accompanied Martyr in quitting our shores. John à Lasco had departed before them. Their congregations were now also commanded to leave the country; and England thus [3] lost in them many ingenious artists. Martyr no sooner arrived at Strasburg in November, than he [4] informed Calvin of the state in which he had left England, and of the imprisonment of Cranmer, Hooper, Coverdale, and others; of the weakness with which some had conformed to the altered state; of the constancy with which far more than he could have thought had renounced it; of his consequent belief, that numerous would be the martyrs, if Gardiner might have his will; and of the general opinion, that the present calamity would not be long. He wrote [5] soon after-

[1] Strype. A. Wood.
[2] Godwin, Ann. 281.
[3] See before, p. 204.
[4] Strype.
[5] Decemb. 1553. Gerdesii Misc. iv. 669

wards to Bullinger, and told him that many English youths from our two Universities were now at Strasburg, the expense of whose studies was paid by the pious merchants of the place, under the hope that, on the return of Protestantism to England, the Church of England might then be served by their acquirements.

Mary had [1] now assembled her first parliament, in which one of the earliest Acts that passed was a confirmation of her legitimacy, and a declaration that the sentence of divorce between Henry and Catharine was void. The preamble to it maliciously stated, as if he had been the sole agent in the business, "that Thomas Cranmer, late archbishop of Canterbury, did most ungodlily, and against law, judge the divorce upon *his own unadvised understanding of the Scriptures*, and upon the testimony of the Universities, and some bare and most untrue conjectures." There can be no doubt that Gardiner, as Burnet relates it, framed the statute. Nor can there be any hesitation to pronounce, with the historian, Mary's chancellor as "past all shame." He was at the [2] time thus reminded of what he wished to forget, or hoped was forgotten, his own [3] activity in promoting the affair which now was charged

[1] Octob. 5.

[2] In a Translation of his 'De Vera Obedientia, by Michael Wood, published in 1553, with the date of Oct. 26.

[3] See vol. i. p. 13, p. 16.

upon Cranmer alone; his employment in it long before Cranmer was even known to Henry. "[1] THEN he published the king's divorce, and second marriage, to be done by the undoubted Word of God, the censures of the most famous Universities of the world, the judgment of the Church of England, and by Act of parliament, whereof he himself was the procurer in the Universities, and in all points *the principal doer.* NOW he layeth all the fault to *the archbishop of Canterbury,* as though it had been the archbishop's only deed. THEN he brake the queen's head, in procuring and affirming her to be illegitimate. NOW he giveth her a plaster with recanting and saying *she is legitimate.*"

The legitimacy of the queen being thus established; and her title of supreme head of the Church being still retained, not without [2] alarm,

[1] M. Wood's Transl. ut supr. Pref. sign. A. 5.

[2] In the Advice given by the bishops assembled at Bononia to Julius III. dated Oct. 20, 1553, they tell the pontiff, "As for England, upon which you value yourself so much, as if it were to be ascribed to your good fortune, that *that queen takes care to extirpate heresy out of the kingdom,* you have certainly no share in that praise. Then we fear, *lest that sudden felicity should not be lasting.* Besides the queen styles herself *supreme head of that kingdom,* next and immediately after Christ; so that, though the old worship and ceremonies were never so much restored, your power and authority is not to be retrieved." The State of the Church of Rome when the Reformation began,

however, to the zealous friends of the pope; the repeal of all the laws that had been made concerning religion, in the time of Edward, was the next Act of the parliament, which enjoined, that after the twentieth of December, no other form of divine service should be used than that with which the reign of Henry concluded.

The convocation, which, according to custom, met at the same time with the parliament, was summoned by Bonner, now restored to the see of London, and who in this instance was exercising the duty of him who was then in the Tower, the primate of all England; to whose approaching imprisonment he had, not many days before, adverted with the usual insolence of vulgar minds: "[1] Mr. Canterbury must be placed where is meet for him." In the lower house of convocation, while the principal labours of Cranmer, the liturgy and articles of the last reign, were denounced as heretical, the subject chosen for disputation, at the desire of the queen, had been the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The prolocutor, Dr. Weston, and all the rest of the assembly, except five or six, maintained the corporal presence in that sacrament. Among the dissen-

&c. published by Dr. Clagett, Preacher of Gray's Inn, 1688. p. 33. The papal supremacy, however, was soon afterwards conceded by Mary.

[1] Burnet, ii. Rec. P. II. B. II. No. 7.

tients was one, who afterwards confirmed his arguments with the testimony of his blood, Philpot, archdeacon of Winchester. He required that Ridley, and other Protestant prelates, might be also allowed to dispute upon the controverted points. As yet to those in prison such permission was not granted. Meanwhile another day was fixed for a public disputation, when, as Godwin tells us, "[1] the truth was oppressed by multitude, not reason;" and when the prolocutor, unable to deny the force of this remark, upon the Protestants exclaiming, "We have the Word," (meaning that the Scriptures were on their side,) could only reply "But we have the Sword." These debates led the way, however, to the removal of Cranmer, and Ridley, and Latimer, from their prison to Oxford. The complaints of the unfairness exhibited as well in the preceding disputation, as in the exclusion of the ablest among the Reformers from a share in it, awakened the Romish party to a sense of shame, and occasioned the controversy to be renewed in the University, the management of it being entrusted to a committee formed both of Cambridge and Oxford divines. On the 8th of March, 1554, the lieutenant of the Tower was directed "[2] to deliver to Sir John Williams, the bodies of the late archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Ridley, and Mr. Latimer, to be

[1] Ann. 282. [2] Council-Book, Archæol. xviii.

by him conveyed to Oxford." Foxe relates, that it was about the tenth of April, when these venerable prisoners arrived at Windsor on their way to the University. It was on the fourteenth of that month, when they were led from the common prison in Oxford, called Bocardo, to meet their opponents in the church of St. Mary. To the prisoners on that day were submitted the questions that were to be agitated; which were these.

I. Whether the natural body of Christ was really in the sacrament.

II. Whether any other substance did remain, after the words of consecration, than the body of Christ.

III. Whether in the mass there was a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the dead and living.

Cranmer had already given the [1] negative to all these propositions in his book on the Lord's Supper. He was now required to abandon what he had asserted, and to return to the unity of the Church. The advantages of unity he acknowledged, if the unity professed was in agreement with the words of Christ. Pondering a moment on the propositions before him, he asked whether by a natural body they meant an organical sensible body? They replied, the same that was born of the Virgin. He directly denied it; and assert-

[1] See the account of his book on the Lord's Supper in the present vol. chap. x.

ing the other questions also to be in opposition to the Scriptures, declined admission to the proffered concord. The prolocutor then required him to draw up a written [1] opinion upon all the points, on the sixteenth to be ready personally to answer the maintainers of them, and till then remanded him to his confinement.

To Ridley was assigned the seventeenth day of the month, and to Latimer the following day, for their share in the contest. Throughout it the three champions of the Reformation were not only often interrupted by rude clamours, not only scoffed at and reviled, but distracted by various opponents, all urging and demanding answer at the same time. "[2] Yet they forced their adversaries to admire them. Cranmer did learnedly; and, according to the dignity wherein he so many years had flourished, gravely: Ridley, acutely and readily: Latimer, with a pleasant tartness, and more solidly than could be expected of a man so near the age of fourscore." It has been, however, said of Cranmer, on this occasion, by Dr. Lingard, that "[3] he was severely pressed with passages from the Fathers;" as Gilpin had [4] ventured, many years before, to say of Ridley as well as the

[1] Collier has printed this opinion, which is in Latin, from a manuscript copy in his own possession. Vol. ii. Rec. No. 71. Foxe has given an English copy.

[2] Godwin, Ann, 301. [3] Hist. Eng. 8vo. vii. 271.

[4] In his Life of Latimer.

archbishop; unjustly lowering them in their defence to the character only of schoolmen; pronouncing that of Cranmer also to have been noways extraordinary, and that his modesty seemed to have been over-awed by his audience. Then neither Gilpin nor Dr. Lingard, I am persuaded, had carefully perused the long account which Foxe has preserved of Cranmer's disputation. Instead of being "severely pressed" by his opponents "with passages from the Fathers," it was his easy task, it was to his honour, it was to their shame, that in their citations of such authorities he convicted them repeatedly of blunders that depreciated their learning, of falsehoods that disgraced their honesty. Oglethorpe had no sooner commenced his argument, than Cranmer bade him mend his incorrect Latin. The prolocutor, attempting to falsify a sentence in Chrysostome, was checked by the archbishop, who told him that he never heard so vain an inference as that which he drew from the passage; and, while exposing to the people the misinterpretation of the eloquent Father, Cranmer was answered only at the instigation of the prolocutor, and by the signal of his outstretched hand, with hisses and clamour. Again, when his opponent, in return, charged him also with altering a word in Hilary, and that opponent appealed to Dr. Smith, the well-known enemy of Cranmer, for the truth of what he alleged, that enemy was astonished at the ignorant appeal, and was silent.

Cranmer, with his usual meekness, replied, that he had not with him the book, which at once would prove or deny the charge. After the disputation one of his academical auditors, however, incensed at the malicious proceeding, carried to him in the prison "[1] a book to shew that he was right concerning the aforesaid matter." The generous student was seized by the bailiffs, carried to the prolocutor and his colleagues, and for his pains was himself imprisoned. Yet once more: Bishop Jewell, who had been one of the notaries on the present occasion, in his controversy afterwards with Hardinge, [2] reminds him of Cranmer then citing an authority from Theodoret, which, because it was decisive against his opponents, was utterly refused. Was such a man likely to be overcome in discussions, of which the Fathers were the topic? Let Cranmer himself tell us how he was used, and we shall then better judge of the controversy and its issue. Thus he wrote to the lords of the Council.

"[3] In right humble wise sheweth unto your

[1] A. Wood relates the whole of this anecdote respecting the student. Ann. Univ. Ox. under the year 1554. Foxe details through many pages the disputation in English. In the University Library at Cambridge, are preserved copies of it in Latin.

[2] Jewell's Reply to Hardinge, 1564. p. 420.

[3] Foxe. Strype.

honourable lordships, Thomas Cranmer, late archbishop of Canterbury, beseeching the same to be a means for me unto the queen's Highness for her mercy and pardon. Some of you know by what means I was brought and trained unto the will of our late sovereign lord, king Edward VI. and what I spake against the same; wherein I refer me to the reports of your honours and worships. Furthermore, this is to signify to your lordships, that upon Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday last past, were open disputations here in Oxford, against me, Mr. Ridley, and Mr. Latimer, in three matters concerning the sacrament. First, of the real presence. Secondly, of transubstantiation. And, thirdly, of the sacrifice of the mass. Upon Monday against me; upon Tuesday against Dr. Ridley; and upon Wednesday against Mr. Latimer. How the other two were ordered I know not; for we were separated: so that none of us knoweth what the other said; nor how they were ordered. But as concerning myself I can report. Dr. Chedsey was appointed to dispute against me. But the disputation was so confused, that I never knew the like: every man bringing forth what he liked, without order: and such haste was made, that no answer could be suffered to be taken fully to any argument, before another brought a new argument. And in such weighty matters, the disputation must needs be ended in one day, which can scantly be

ended in three months. And when we had answered *them*, they would not appoint us one day to bring forth our proofs, that they might answer *us*; being required by me thereunto. Whereas I myself have more to say, than can be well discussed, as I suppose, in twenty days. The means to resolve the truth had been to have suffered us to answer fully to all that they could say; and then they again to answer us fully to all that we can say. But why they would not answer us, what other cause can there be, but that either they feared their matter, or that they were not able to answer us? Or else for some consideration they made such haste, not to seek the truth, but to condemn us: that it must be done in post haste, before the matters could be thoroughly heard. For in all haste we were all three condemned of heresy. Thus much I thought good to signify to your lordships, that you may know the indifferent handling of matters: leaving the judgment thereof unto your wisdoms. And I beseech your lordships to remember me, a poor prisoner, unto the queen's Majesty; and I shall pray, as I do daily, unto God, for the long preservation of your good lordships in all godliness and felicity. April 23, [1554.]"

CHAPTER III.

1554.

Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, condemned as heretics—Further remarks of Cranmer on the Oxford disputation—Disputation at Cambridge intended—Hesitation of the Council as to further proceedings with the three prisoners—The treatment of the prisoners—The marriage of Philip and Mary—The consequence of it to Protestantism—Remarks upon it—Anecdote relating to Elizabeth, by one of the remarkers—Persecution of the Reformers.

THE preceding letter of Cranmer to the lords of the Council, had been entrusted by him to the prolocutor Weston, who was immediately proceeding to London. On his journey, Weston was base enough to open it; and, careless of shame, as he had been also in the disputation, returned it to the archbishop. By [1] other means, no doubt, it was afterwards conveyed to the Council. Among the Letters of the Martyrs in Emanuel College, Cambridge, it is still preserved.

[1] By the carrier perhaps; as he speaks of such conveyance in another letter, at the same time, to Martin and Story, the proctors at his trial. Foxe.

It had been on the 20th of April, that Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, "were condemned of heresy." It was then, that Weston contemptuously said to Cranmer, he had been overcome in disputation. Not so, replied the archbishop, [1] for I was not suffered to oppose as I would, nor could answer as I required, unless with four or five at once continually interrupting me I would, like them, have "*brawled*." The sentence of condemnation was now read. From this judgment Cranmer [2] then appealed to the Almighty Power only: we shall presently find him appealing also to an earthly one. To the Bocardo prison he was immediately re-conducted, while Latimer and Ridley were consigned, at present, to the houses of Oxford [3] citizens. On the following day, the mass with a general procession was celebrated. Cranmer, from the darker abode of his prison, was insultingly [4] summoned to behold it; and from the house in which he was lodged, in like manner, was brought the venerable Latimer, who supposing that to the stake he was now to be led, but finding that he was only to witness a ceremony that he abhorred, [5] hid his face from the passing pomp.

The Oxford disputations had no sooner closed, than similar proceedings at Cambridge were meditated. With the ignorance and ridiculous con-

[1] Foxe. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid. [5] Ibid.

duct of [1] Weston the prolocutor, with the insults instead of arguments to which the adversaries of Cranmer in general had recourse, the sister University was now to be amused; while Hooper, Bradford, Taylor, Philpot, and other learned Protestants, all whose names are enrolled among the Marian martyrs, were designed, as they expressed it, to be "baited." Of this project, as well as of the disgraceful treatment of Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, Hooper had heard. He therefore [2] advised his fellow-prisoners not to agree to any other than a disputation in writing, except before the queen and her Council, or before either of the houses of parliament. They might then be fairly heard. On the other hand, our adversaries, said he, would at Cambridge so determine the matter beforehand, after the Oxford example, as to cry out [3] *victory*, when "false allegations,

[1] "Prolocutor, qui maximè sobrius et omnium sapientissimus esse debuerat, ineptit maximè, nunc cachinnans, nunc minitans, nunc blandiens, nunc innocentissimis patribus insultans, nunc poculum manu tenens, et egregiè potans, et exclamans, Urge hoc!" Laur. Humfredi Vita Juelli, Episc. Sar. 1573, p. 105, See also before, p. 396.

[2] Foxe, and Strype, Ecc. Mem. iii. 119.

[3] Dr. Humphry observes, that when Weston, at the close of the disputation with Cranmer, shouted, "vicit *veritas*," he should have said, "vicit *vanitas*." Vit. Juel. ut supr. This learned biographer also reports the behaviour of the auditors at the disputation, as in disgraceful conformity with the conduct of the prolocutor: "Non erat quietum auditorium, ut iste (Weston) significavit, sed plenum tumultibus; ubi, præter

mocks, and taunts," would warrant no other exclamation than *vanity*. It is not only in Cranmer's own letter, it is not only in Foxe's account, it is in the contemporary powerful narrative also of Laurence Humphry, afterwards president of Magdalen College, Oxford, that we find a detail of these mockeries in disputation that had induced Hooper to protest against a repetition of them. The protestation accordingly of himself, and of those whom he addressed, put a stop to the intention of the oral debate at Cambridge.

The sentence upon the silenced prisoners at Oxford remained to be confirmed by Mary and her Council. On the 3d of May, "[1] it was ordered by the lords of the Council, that the mayor of Oxford should bring in his bill of allowances for the charges of doctor Cranmer, doctor Ridley, and Mr. Latimer, and should have a warrant for the same; and further, it was resolved by their lordships, that the judges and the queen's counsel learned should be called together, and their opinions demanded *what they think in law her Highness may do* touching the said Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, being already, by both the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, judged to be obstinate heretics; which matter is the rather

clamores, supplosiones pedum, sputa, screatus, et hujusmodi, nihil ferè audires!"

[1] Council-Book, Archæol. ut supr.

to be consulted upon, for that the said Cranmer is already attainted."

The hesitation, thus evinced, continued many months. Meantime the prisoners were deprived of their own servants, and by those who attended them appear to have been little regarded. "[1] The manner of [our] entreating," said Ridley, "doth change, as sour ale in summer." Sometimes they were prohibited from communicating with each other; sometimes were charged with absurd attempts to escape from their confinement. By no friendly visits of the academics were they consoled. By the townsmen of Oxford, however, as by many persons also in the metropolis, they were supplied with various necessaries; yet money, which had been sent for their use,[2] appears to have been embezzled. The[3] government did indeed *order* for them both food and raiment, although, to its shame, they who obeyed the order[4] appear to have sought in vain from that government the payment of what they had[5] expended in conse-

[1] Ridley to Bradford, Lett. of the Martyrs, 58.

[2] Strype.

[3] Ridley to Bradford, Lett. of the Martyrs, 69.

[4] Strype.

[5] Dr. Humphry wrote to archbishop Parker on this occasion, and mentions the debt as "*due for the table of Cranmer, by the queen's majesty's appointment.*" MSS. Corp. Chr. Coll. Camb. Strype.

quence of it. To the bailiffs of Oxford this order had been given. In the early part of Elizabeth's reign, these officers presented a memorial to archbishop Parker, in which they state, "[1] that, in the second and third years of king Philip and queen Mary, archbishop Cranmer, bishop Latimer, and bishop Ridley, were by order of the Council committed to the custody of them, and so continued a certain time; and that for them they disbursed the sum of 63*l.* 10*s.* 2*d.* whereof but 20*l.* was paid to them. Therefore, they pray his grace, and the rest of the bishops, to be a means among themselves, that the remaining sum may be paid to them, being 43*l.* 10*s.* 2*d.* or some part thereof; otherwise, they and their poor wives and children should be utterly undone." Strype had seen a [2] book, in which the diet of the three prisoners, when they were allowed to eat together, is mentioned; and he copies from it a dinner on the first of October, (1554), viz.:

Bread and Ale, .. ii^{d}.	Item, Ling, .. viii^{d}.
Item, Oysters, .. i^{d}.	Fresh Salmon, .. x^{d}.
Item, Bread, ... ii^{d}.	Wine, ... iii^{d}.
Item, Eggs, ... ii^{d}.	Cheese & Pears, ii^{d}.

It is added, that they constantly ate suppers as well as dinners; that their meals usually amounted to three or four shillings, never exceeding four; that, at both meals, cheese and pears were the

[1] Strype. [2] MSS. Corp. C. C. C. ut supr.

last dish; and that they had always wine, of which the price was ever three-pence, and no more.

Ere three months of their imprisonment, subsequent to their condemnation, had passed, the queen gave her hand to Philip of Spain. The complete restoration of England to Romanism was the immediate consequence. But Roman Catholics, as well as Protestants, had not scrupled to express their dissatisfaction at the prospect of a foreign prince on the throne of England. It might be supposed, from the [1] narrative of Burnet, that this subject of almost universal sorrow had called forth the public indignation also of the imprisoned Reformers. For the historian says, "that there was a very abusive libel printed in the form of a letter, as written by *Bradford* to the queen, in which it was said, that it was believed her Majesty intended to give the crown to the king, hoping, that he then would keep company with her more, and live more chaste, contrary to his nature, &c." Strype rescues the martyr Bradford from the imputation of such a proceeding, by [2] informing us, that the writer of the letter, was indeed a John Bradford, but one who had been a servant to Sir William Skipwith, and afterwards to a privy councillor in Spain, with

[1] Hist. Ref. vol. iii. under the year 1554.

[2] Ecc. Mem. iii. 250.

whom he had lived two or three years. Bradford, the prisoner, now employed himself in writing consolatory [1] letters to his friends, or in communicating to Cranmer and his companions, from whom in another prison he was now separated, thoughts upon religious topics of the [2] deepest importance. But as Strype has copied what has been related of the other Bradford, apparently too the whole of his libel from a manuscript of Foxe, and as if addressed (as Burnet also says), only to the queen; it may amuse the reader to be informed, that the printed little volume is "[3] An

[1] Foxe has printed many of them; and they are said to have rendered essential service to the progress of the Reformation.

[2] Upon "the holy election and predestination of God." His treatise on this subject he submitted to Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, at Oxford, observing, that if they approved of it, "the rest of the eminent ministers in and about London were willing to sign it also." Strype. Bradford was a predestinarian. Of any answer from Cranmer to him on this occasion, there is no account known. Of Cranmer's opposition to the doctrine of absolute pedestination there are several evidences in these volumes. See vol. i. p. 201. Vol. ii. p. 302-305.

[3] This rare book is in the Lambeth Library. It concludes with a rude poem of twelve stanzas, entitled, "A tragicall blast of the papisticall trompetre for maintenance of the pope's kingdome in Englande." The trumpeter in the first stanza proclaims,

"England is our's both far and near,
"No king shall reign if we say nay:
"Now all shaven crowns to the standard;
"Make room, pull down, for the Spaniard!"

Admonicion to all Englishe men," while it also addresses by name certain of the nobility; that it contains other matter than Strype has given; that it lashes the low amorous propensities of Philip still more severely than the little extract selected by Burnet; and that it records an anecdote relating to Elizabeth in a manner so solemn, as to arrest especial attention. "[1] I call God for a true and just witness," the writer says, "that I have heard with mine ears, and seen the same persons with mine eyes, that have said, if ever the king (Philip) might have a just title to the crown, and obtain it, he would make that most virtuous lady Elizabeth's Grace sure for ever coming to inherit the same, or any other of our cursed nation. For they say, if they could keep England in subjection, they could do more with England and Flanders, than all the rest of the king's kingdoms. Remember, if this warning be not sufficient to cause noble men to take heed that so virtuous a lady, so beautiful, and so comely a princess, should [not] first of all, beside all the great number that should follow afterwards, be either banished the island, or else put to death miserably for that which should be her own right by just and lawful descent."

But if the English Reformers were silent upon the subject of the Spanish match, their foreign

[1] Sign. E. iii. and iiii.

friends were not so. John à Lasco [1] foretold the fate of it; that it would be unhappy. Peter Martyr to his [2] friends communicated an account of the general disturbance occasioned by the queen's intending to marry Philip. These Reformers were now beyond the reach of the persecution, which in England was pressing forward its deadly step. Our own reformed preachers, now immured in the metropolis, are said to have been "[3] alarmed;" and alarmed because of the revival of the ancient statutes against heretics. "To ward off the impending danger," Dr. Lingard says, "they composed and forwarded petitions, including a confession of their faith, both to the king and queen, and to the lords and commons assembled in parliament." But this historian forbears to relate, that what he calls petitions, were in fact [4] challenges to justify the Reformation, after the example which Cranmer had afforded; that, without any reference to "the impending danger" of the sanguinary statutes, the challenge of our preachers had been made, for it bears the date of May, and the revival of those statutes that of December, 1554; and that, after the unpopular marriage of Philip and Mary, they repeated the declaration that had preceded it. They were

[1] Letter to his friend Hardenberg. Gerdes. Misc. ii. 697.

[2] To Calvin; Strype. To Utenhovius; Gerdes. Misc. iv. 668.

[3] Lingard, Hist. Eng. 8vo. vii. 261.

[4] As Burnet and Strype rightly call them.

ready [1] to maintain against any opponents, they said, the conformity to God's Word of the homilies and service of Edward's reign; they were ready to vindicate the right of marriage to the clergy; they were ready to confute the tenets of communion under one kind, of transubstantiation, of the sacrifice of the mass, of the invocation of saints, and of a liturgy in an unknown tongue. They warned all men not to assent to any kind of rebellion or sedition against the queen; and bade them, where they could not obey without disobedience to God, with all patience and humility to suffer as the will and pleasure of the higher powers might adjudge.

Such had been the lesson taught them by Cranmer. For thus he had addressed the sovereign, whose heart, however, was steeled against him, as now it also was against his followers. "[2] As concerning the state of religion, as it is used in this realm at present, if it please your Majesty to license me, I would gladly write my mind unto your Majesty. I will never, God willing, be author of sedition, to move subjects from the obedience to their heads and rulers; which is an offence most detestable. If I have uttered my mind to your Majesty, being a Christian queen

[1] Burnet. Strype.

[2] The remainder of his letter to the queen, before cited. See p. 360-362.

and governor of this realm, (of whom I am most assuredly persuaded that your gracious intent is, above all other regards, to prefer God's true word, His honour and glory,) if I have uttered, I say, my mind unto your Majesty, then I shall think myself discharged. For it lies not in me, but in your Grace only, to see the reformation of things that be amiss. To private subjects it appertaineth not to reform things, but quietly to suffer that they cannot amend. Yet nevertheless, to shew your Majesty my mind in things appertaining unto God, methink it my duty; knowing that I do, and considering the place which in time past I have occupied. Yet will I not presume thereunto, without your Grace's pleasure first known, and your licence obtained." To the disputation at Oxford, but upon the solitary subject of the corporal presence only, Cranmer was indeed referred; and then was left in prison, where the review of his answer on the sacrament to Gardiner, but no permitted discussion of religious topics for the queen, employed the hours of his solitude.

The application also of the other preachers in each instance was refused. It was after the first of these, that the hated nuptials were celebrated, and that the revival of the ancient laws against heretics soon followed the nuptials. Neither the lady sovereign, nor her foreign spouse, was inclined to abolish in this respect the cruelty of the papal church. On the contrary, as Dr. Lingard

himself asserts, "[1] the foulest blot on the character of this queen is her long and cruel persecution of the Reformers. The sufferings of the victims naturally begat an antipathy to the woman, by whose authority they were inflicted." But the writer adds, "it is, however, but fair to recollect what I have already noticed, that the extirpation of erroneous doctrine was inculcated as a duty by the leaders of every religious party. Mary only practised what *they* taught." Now by such, as are not well acquainted with the history of Mary's reign, it might hence be supposed that by our Reformers she had been instructed in the lesson of persecution; and the words of a recent noble writer might hence be thought to derive support, where he says, that "it would appear to be little known, that the statutes, *which enabled Mary to burn those who had conformed to the Church of her father and brother, were Protestant statutes.*" But Dr. Lingard shall rectify this assertion. "[2] Though it had been held in the last reign," the historian observes, "that by the common law of the land, heresy was a crime punishable with death, *it was* [now] *deemed advisable* to revive the statutes which had formerly been enacted to suppress the doctrines of the lollards. Gardiner apprised the chief of the prisoners

[1] Lingard, Hist. Eng. 8vo. vii. 330.

[2] Hist. Eng. 8vo. vii. 260.

of the statutes [thus] enacted, and put them in mind of the punishment which awaited their disobedience." In other words, he reminded them of the lesson that for ages past had been taught by the Church of Rome; but he ventured not to charge them as having followed it with her eagerness, or as having announced their intention of consigning to the flames all who might maintain religious tenets at variance with their own. It was reserved for the learned historian, whom we have just cited, to accuse our Reformers of an *intention,* which by other writers is believed not to have existed, and which in the corrected copy of the code of laws that they had formed, it has [1] already been shewn, is at once denied. "[2] The statutes," which now were to kindle the flames, "had been repealed," as another learned writer of the Church of Rome admits, "in the late reign." A third, however, pronounces Mary's revival of them, in a spirit of the bitterest intolerance, as an enactment [3] exalting the character of a Christian sovereign.

[1] See before, B. II. chap. 13.

[2] Phillips, Life of Card. Pole, 8vo. ii. 217.

[3] "Legibus enim antiquis de puniendis hæreticis, *iterùm zelo principe Christiano dignissimo renovatis,* non solum ille, (Cranmerus,) sed et aliquot pseudo-prophetarum centuriæ sunt sublatæ." Sanders, De Schism. Angl. ed. 1586. This inhuman remark is not in the first edition of Sanders's book. It was probably added by Rishton, the suspicious editor of the second edition.

"[1] With whom the persecution under Mary originated," Dr. Lingard further remarks, "is a matter of uncertainty. By the reformed writers the infamy of the measure is usually allotted to Gardiner, more, *as far as I can judge*, from conjecture and prejudice, than from real information. The charge is not supported by any authentic document: it is weakened by the general tenor of the chancellor's conduct. All that we know with certainty, is, that after the queen's marriage this question was frequently debated by the lords of the council; and that their final resolution was not communicated to her before the beginning of November." Mary certainly replied, "that the punishment of heretics ought to be done without rashness," but concluded her answer with saying, that "especially within London, she would wish none to be burnt without some of the Council's presence, and that both *there* and *every where* there should be good sermons at the same time."

The signal was now given for punishments that in [2] no age of the same religion, in no country, were ever executed with so many circumstances of cruelty. He who will turn to the [3] remonstrance of bishop Jewell, who had been one of

Hist. Eng. 8vo. vii. 259.

[2] See Warton, Life of Sir Thomas Pope, p. 60.

[3] Replie to M. Hardinge's Answer, &c. 1565, pp. 573, 574.

Cranmer's secretaries at the Oxford disputation, in his reply to Hardinge, who is said to have been the chaplain of the lady Jane Grey, but had become a Romish convert, will find that it is not in the narrative of Foxe alone, but by the solemn assertions also of one of the most pious and learned persons of the time, that the various agonizing tortures to which the reformed were led, are but too true, and that extenuations therefore of Mary's conduct, which from her own to the present time have indeed though rarely been offered, are at least injudicious, if not insidious. The Six Articles, the sanguinary stain of Henry's reign, and the production [1] chiefly of Gardiner, were now expected to be also revived. An inquisition too, as in the country of Philip, was dreaded. It was enough however to destroy the confidence of her subjects, it was enough to confirm their aversion to herself and her husband, that the heretic laws, without further enactments, were now compelling them to papal subjection, or daily leading them to the stake.

In February, 1555, the distinguished Reformers, Rogers, Hooper, and Taylor, preceded their numerous brethren at the funeral pyre. Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, were as yet unsummoned to it. Meantime the queen imagined herself about to present an heir to the kingdom. Her mis-

[1] See before, vol. i. p. 272, seq.

taken belief was converted by the public voice into a matter of fact. The [1] Muses only anticipated the birth. But in more than one [2] cathedral, and in other churches, a solemn celebration, as of a real delivery, was observed. The Romanists appealed to the expectation, rather than the reality of such an event, as a [3] proof of the divine favour towards their doctrine. In her imaginary situation, however, Mary appears to have been, as it were, like lady Macbeth, "without compunctious visitings of nature to shake her fell purpose." For Strype tells us, twice, of a letter from Peter Martyr, in which it is asserted that she thought and said, "she could not happily be delivered, nor that any thing could proceed prosperously with her, unless all the heretics were burnt to a man."

[1] A ballad of joy was published: It began,

"Now singe, nowe springe, our care is exil'd,
"Our vertuous quene is quickned with child!
"And yet since her Hignes was planted in peace,
"Her subjects were dubtful of her Highnes' increse;
"But now the recomfort, their murmur doth cease,
"They have their own wyshynge," &c.

See Dibdin, Typogr. Antiq. iv. 407. A ballad which had been addressed to Philip and Mary on their marriage, is also printed. Ib. 409.

[2] Norwich. Strype. But Stow gives a long account also of this celebration at St. Paul's Cathedral in London. 4to. ed. 1060.

[3] Bradford relates this in a letter to his fellow-sufferers. Lett. of the Mart. 439. And the ballad, already cited, abundantly thus presumes upon it.

Burnet, however, only says, that on the 18th of June a letter was written from London to P. Martyr, [1] telling him that it was given out that the queen had said, she could not be happily delivered till all the heretics then in prison were burned. Hence perhaps the communication of Martyr to his friend [2] Alexander, as repeatedly cited by Strype. We might hope, that this was rumour only, if the whole tenor of Mary's conduct did not countenance the truth of it. Her deep malignity towards those who differed from her religious profession, brought indeed [3] two hundred and eighty-eight fellow-creatures to the stake, while in various prisons it left to the destroying hand of famine many others. Rogers, the protomartyr, supposed her to have been misled in her eagerness for persecution by Gardiner. No, said that prelate, in answer to the supposition, " [4] The queen went before me, and it was her own motion."

But the queen well knew the temper and the proceedings of her chancellor. Him, who had

[1] Burnet, Hist. Ref. iii. under the year 1555, where he refers to Martyr's Loci Com. 1626, fol. 769.

[2] Pet. Martyr ad Alexand. Strype Life of Cranm. B. iii. ch. 17. Again, B. iii. ch. 26. Alexander had been Cranmer's secretary, and was at this time a prebendary of Canterbury.

[3] Lord Burghley's Account. Strype, Eccl. Mem. iii. 474, and Rec. p. 291.

[4] Foxe.

with so much zeal [1] contributed to the enactment of the sanguinary Six Articles in her father's reign, she could direct without fear of remonstrance, and with the belief of entire co-operation in the cruelties of her own. The reprinting of his book at Strasburg, *De vera obedientia*, which he had first published in 1534, and to which Bonner had prefixed a laudatory preface; the translation of it also by Michael Wood into English, which, in 1553 was printed at Rouen, and sent over into England; now tended not a little to augment his harshness. The books exposed his fellow-tyrant and himself to just ridicule and censure. The first reformed preachers that were brought before him, scrupled not to remind him of that which, in the time of Henry, both he and Bonner had there taught with such pretended loyalty, but now disclaimed with such consummate impudence. "[2] You wrote truly against the pope, and were sworn against him," said Dr. Rowland Taylor to Gardiner examining him. "I tell thee," was the reply, "it was Herod's oath, unlawful; and, therefore, ought to be broken and not kept; and our holy father the pope hath discharged me of it." So, when Bradford reminded him of his inconsistency, again he resorted to his former plea, "Tush, Herod's oaths a man should make no conscience at."—"But, my lord,

[1] See before, vol. i. p. 272, seq.

[2] Foxe.

these are *no Herod's oaths, no unlawful oaths,*" said Bradford, "but oaths according to God's Word, as you yourself have well affirmed in your book, *De vera obedientia.*" He was now intent upon urging capital punishments; and, notwithstanding he was so notoriously known to be the great instrument of burning and destroying so many Protestants, a [1] Jesuit has represented him "as mild and merciful." Of a Jesuit alone this is the assertion. And yet there was [2] hardly an arrest, an examination, or a punishment, in which Gardiner was not active. "Mark the marvellous confidence of his panegyrist," says Strype, "in endeavouring *to face out a thing*, the contrary to which was most notoriously known, and severely felt." It was upon heretics of distinction, who were said to have misled their inferiors, that Gardiner [3] advised those punishments first to be inflicted. Against the reformed prelates, Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and Hooper, this advice was evidently levelled. Hooper soon suffered in con-

[1] Father Parsons, or Persons, a convert from the Church of England to that of Rome, and a traitor to his country. Vindic. of Cranmer by the present writer, 8vo. xcii. 12mo. 105. By a writer of his own communion, his mind has been described, as his numerous writings were, "dark, imposing, problematical, seditious." Mem. of Panzani, by the Rev. J. Berrington, Introd. p. 28.

[2] See Turner's Reign of Mary, 282.

[3] Collier.

sequence of it; Latimer and Ridley ere long followed; and Cranmer was awhile reserved, only first to be brutally insulted and then to be insidiously soothed for martyrdom at the same stake where those two friends expired.

CHAPTER IV.

1555.

Cranmer's and other books prohibited—The reunion of the Church of England with that of Rome—Proceedings against Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, renewed—Cranmer first brought before the papal commissioners—His condemnation deferred—Ridley and Latimer condemned and burnt—The conduct of Cranmer upon that occasion.

THE convocation in the preceding year had [1] petitioned the king and queen, that Cranmer's treatise of the sacrament, the late service-books, and others which they named heretical, should be burnt; that all who possessed them should be required to bring them in, or else be treated as the favourers of heresy; and that upon books henceforward printed, or to be sold, a vigilant eye should be kept. Accordingly the royal [2] proclamation did prohibit, though it consigned not to the flames, all the writings not only of Cranmer, and of our countrymen, Tindal, Hooper,

[1] Burnet. Strype.

[2] Ames, 518.

Latimer, Coverdale, Barnes, Turner, Becon, Frith, Bale, and even Hall, the chronicler; but those also of the distinguished foreigners, Oecolampadius, Zuinglius, Calvin, Pomerane, John à Lasco, Bullinger, Bucer, Melancthon, Ochin, Erasmus, and Peter Martyr.

Before the close also of 1554, Pole, the legate of the papal see, had reached this country, in order to reunite the Church of England with that of Rome. The palace, of which Cranmer had been dispossessed, was prepared for his residence. The distinction of supreme head now no longer accompanied the regal title; and the power of the pontiff would again have here been absolute, if he had been able to withhold his assurance of the abbey lands to the new owners, the lords and gentlemen by whom they had been obtained. Even the Roman Catholic prelates and clergy petitioned, that he would not insist on a restitution of these revenues. But lest he might, an Act of Parliament was passed, which gave to the present proprietors the security they required; while, in return, the pontiff, [1] although most essentially weakened by the alienation of that wealth on which his power so much depended, was reinstated in his supremacy.

The new year opened to Cranmer, and his fellow-prisoners, with no alleviation of their me-

[1] Warton, Life of Sir T. Pope, 43.

lancholy state. Nearly nine months had passed when the condemnation, which Weston had pronounced upon them, was considered necessary to be repeated by commissioners who should derive their authority from Rome. When Weston was their judge, that authority had not been received in England; nor by any law then in force was his sentence justifiable. By the legate therefore a commission was issued to examine, absolve, or degrade, or deliver to the secular arm, Latimer and Ridley. In regard to Cranmer, another was sent by the pope himself. To Brookes, bishop of Gloucester, on this occasion the delegate of the cardinal *de Puteo,* who was the principal commissioner named by the pontiff, for the sake of form; and to the civilians Martin and Story, who were the royal proctors; was deputed the cognizance of the crimes alleged against the archbishop. On the [1] 9th of September they opened their commission in the church of St. Mary at Oxford, and settled other preliminaries as to the proceeding. It was not till the 12th that all things were ready for the renovated trial. Brookes then was seated on a lofty scaffold, erected over the high altar; beneath him were the proctors, with other civilians; and around them a numerous auditory. From his prison guarded, Cranmer then was intro-

[1] Processus contra Cranmerum. MSS. Lambeth. Lib. No. 1136.

duced. His dress was that of a black gown, with his doctor's hood over it. His head was as yet covered. Nor, when he saw the papal representative on his throne, did he "vail his bonnet," but stood silent till the charge against him was proclaimed, which was, "Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, appear here, and make answer to that which shall be laid to thy charge; that is to say, for blasphemy, incontinency, and heresy; and make answer here to the bishop of Gloucester, representing the pope's person."

Being now brought nearer to the scaffold, and observing the regal proctors, to them, as the representatives of the sovereign, he respectfully bowed, and pulled off his cap. To Brookes he still refused this tribute; when the mitred commissioner, resenting the slight, told him, it might beseem him well, considering the authority that was represented, not to withhold from him the same courteous acknowledgment. The archbishop answered, [1]That once he had taken a solemn oath, never to consent to the readmission, into the realm of England, of the papal authority; that still he would keep that oath; and that therefore no sign or token, which might argue his consent to receiving the same, would he give: Not for any contempt of the commissioner's person, he continued, did he thus act; for if his

[1] Foxe. Burnet. Strype.

commission had been regal, like that of the proctors, instead of papal, he would not have failed immediately to respect it.

Brookes then addressed him in a long speech, no less distinguished by [1] absurdity than by abuse, in which he reminded him of the charges proclaimed against him; urged him to repent of his apostasy; bade him consider in his own case the tender mercies of Mary, by pretending that yet she spared him, under the hope of amendment; and condescended to be the first of those treacherous advisers, who, in order to make him "unsay what he had said," resorted to the gullery with which the poor archbishop was afterwards befooled and cheated, saying, "As for the loss of your estimation, it is ten to one that when you were archbishop of Canterbury, and metropolitan of England, it is ten to one, I say, *that you shall be as well still, yea, and rather better.*"

The proctor Martin followed the delegate in an oration, condensing the insolence of the latter

[1] Brookes republished in 1555 the sermon which he had preached late in 1553 before Mary, and had then printed, on the subject of Jairus's speech to Christ, "*My daughter is even now dead, but come and lay thy hand upon her, and she shall live.*" These words he applied to the kingdom and church of England upon the late defection from the pope, even dead before Mary came to reign, but then reviving and living again. The Protestants rightly censured him as making himself Jairus, England his daughter, and the queen Christ. Strype. Ecc. Mem. iii. 74.

into a smaller compass; after which he exhibited the instrument that empowered him and Story to act as the royal proctors, as well as the articles of accusation against the prisoner. His oration being ended, the archbishop said, "Shall I now make my answer?" Martin replied, "As you think good: no man shall hinder you."

The archbishop, then kneeling down, said first the Lord's Prayer; then, rising up, recited the articles of the Creed; and afterwards [1] thus declared his protestation against the proceedings.

"Cranmer. This I do profess as touching my faith, and make my protestation, which I desire you to note. I will never consent that the bishop of Rome shall have any jurisdiction within this realm.

"Story. Take a note thereof.

"Martin. Mark, D. Cranmer, how you answer for yourself. You refuse and deny him, by whose laws you do remain in life, being otherwise attainted of high treason, and but a dead man by the laws of this realm.

"Cranmer. I protest before God I was no traitor; but indeed I confessed more at my arraignment than was true.

"Martin. That is not to be reasoned at this present. You know you were condemned for a

[1] Strype omits this curious part of the process, merely referring his reader to the martyrology of Foxe.

traitor, and *res judicata pro veritate accipitur.* But proceed to your matter.

" Cranmer. My lord," addressing the bishop of Gloucester, " you have very learnedly and eloquently in your oration put me in remembrance of many things touching myself, wherein I do not mean to spend the time in answering of them. I acknowledge God's goodness to me in all His gifts, and thank Him as heartily for this state wherein I find myself now, as ever I did for the time of my prosperity; and it is not the loss of my promotions that grieveth me. The greatest grief I have at this time, and one of the greatest that ever I had in all my life, is, to see the king and queen's Majesties by their proctors here to become my accusers, and that in their own realm, and country, before a foreign power. If I have transgressed the laws of the land, their Majesties have sufficient authority and power, both from God, and by the ordinance of this realm, to punish me, whereunto I both have been, and at all time shall be, content to submit myself.

" Alas, what has the pope to do in England, whose jurisdiction is so far different from the jurisdiction of this realm, that it is impossible to be true to the one, and true to the other? The laws also are so diverse, that whosoever sweareth to both, must needs incur perjury to the one. Which as oft as I remember, even for the love that I bear to her Grace, I cannot but be heartily

sorry to think upon it, how that her Highness the day of her coronation, at which time she took a solemn oath to observe all the laws and liberties of this realm of England, at the same time also took an oath to the bishop of Rome, and promised to maintain that see. The state of England being so repugnant to the supremacy of the pope, it is impossible, but she must needs be forsworn to the one. Wherein if her Grace had been faithfully advertised by her Council, then surely she would never have done it.

" The laws of this realm are, that the king of England is the supreme and sole governor of all his countries and dominions; and that he holdeth his crown and sceptre of himself, by the ancient laws, customs, and descents, of the kings of the realm, and of none other. The pope saith, that all emperors and kings hold their crowns and regalities of him, and that he may depose them when he list; which is high treason for any man to affirm or think, being born within the king's dominions.

" The laws of England are, that all bishops and priests, offending in cases of felony or treason, are to be judged and tried by the laws and customs of the realm. The pope's laws are, that the secular power cannot judge the spiritual power, and that they are not under their jurisdiction; which robbeth the king of the one part of his people.

" The laws also of England are, that whosoever hindereth the execution or proceeding of the laws of England for any other foreign laws, ecclesiastical or temporal, incurreth the danger of a *premunire*. The pope's laws are, that whosoever hindereth the proceedings or executions of his laws for any other laws of any other king or country, both the prince himself, his Council, all his officers, scribes, clerks, and whosoever give consent or aid to the making or executing of any such laws, stand accursed. A heavy case, if his curse were any thing worth, that the king and queen cannot use their own laws, but they and all their's must stand accursed.

" And as for the matter of heresy and schism, wherewith I am charged, I protest and call God to witness, that I know none that I have maintained. But if that were a heresy to deny the pope's authority, and the religion which the see of Rome hath published to the world these latter years, then all the ancient Fathers of the Primitive Church, the Apostles, and Christ himself, taught heresy; and I desire all present to bear me witness, that I take the traditions and religion of that usurping prelate to be most erroneous, false, and against the doctrine of the whole Scripture; which oftentimes I have well proved by writing, and the author of the same to be very antichrist, so often preached of by the Apostles and Prophets, in whom did most evidently concur

all signs and tokens whereby he was pointed out to the world to be known."

The archbishop then exposed other arrogant pretensions of the pontiff, not without alluding to his own unjustly condemned opinion as to the doctrine of the sacrament of the altar; "for if it can be proved," said he, "by any Doctor above a thousand years after Christ, that Christ's body is there really, I will give over. My book was made seven years ago, and no man hath brought any authors against it." He concluded this uninterrupted defence, by expressing his hope, that the king and queen, if they were rightly informed, would do well. This observation awakened the zeal of Martin.

"Martin. As you understand then, if they maintain the supremacy of Rome, they cannot maintain England too.

"Cranmer. I desire you to declare to the king and queen what I have said, and how their oaths do stand with the realm and the pope. St. Gregory saith, he that taketh upon him to be head of the Universal Church, is worse than the antichrist. If any man can shew me, that it is not against God's Word to hold his stirrup when he taketh his horse, or kiss his feet, as kings do, then I will kiss his feet also. And you, for your part, my lord, are perjured; for now you sit judge for the pope, and yet you did receive your bishopric of the king. You have taken an oath

to be adversary to the realm; for the pope's laws are contrary to the laws of the realm.

"Bp. of Gloucester. You were the cause that I did forsake the pope, and did swear that he ought not to be supreme head, and gave it to king Henry the Eighth, that he ought to be it; and this you made me to do.

"Cranmer. To this I answer, you report me ill, and say not the truth; and I will prove it here before you all. The truth is, that my [1] predecessor, archbishop Warham, gave the supremacy to king Henry the Eighth, and said that he ought to have it before the bishop of Rome, and that God's Word would bear him. And upon the same was there sent to both the Universities, Oxford and Cambridge, to know what the Word of God would do touching the supremacy; and it was reasoned upon, aud argued, at length. So at the last both Universities agreed, and set to their seals, and sent it to king Henry, that he ought to be supreme head, and not the pope. You were then doctor of divinity, and your consent was thereunto as your hand doth appear. Therefore you misreport me, that I was the cause of your falling away from the pope; but it was yourself. All this was in bishop Warham's time, and whilst he was alive; so that it was three quarters of a

[1] See before, vol. i. p. 69.

year after, ere I had the archbishopric of Canterbury in my hands, and before I might do any thing. So that here you have reported of me that, which you cannot prove; which is evil done."

The self-convicted judge could only meanly reply: "We come to examine you; and you, methink, examine us."

After Story had next interposed an oration in behalf of the papal supremacy, Martin again addressed the archbishop; whose words, together with the replies to them, Foxe resolved not to overpass, although the Romish reporter, employed to note them, had been extremely partial, omitting nothing that might promote the object of the accuser, but much that was favourable to that of the accused. Such as the dialogue was, even thus unfairly described, it is too important not to be copied. The proctor Martin opens it.

"Master Cranmer, you have told here a long glorious tale, pretending some matter of consequence in appearance, but in verity you have no conscience at all. You say that you have sworn once unto king Henry the Eighth against the pope's jurisdiction, and, therefore, you may never forswear the same; and so you make a great matter of conscience in the breach of the said oath. Here will I ask you a question or two.

What if you made an oath to a harlot to live with her in continual adultery, ought you to keep it?

"Cranmer. I think not.

"Martin. What if you did swear never to lend a poor man one penny, ought you to keep it?

"Cranmer. I think not.

"Martin. Herod did swear whatsoever his harlot asked of him he would give her, and he gave her John Baptist's head. Did he well in keeping his oath?

"Cranmer. I think not.

"Martin. Jephthah, one of the judges of Israel, did swear unto God, that if he would give him victory over his enemies, he would offer unto God the first soul that came forth of his house. It happened, that his own daughter came first; and he slew her to save his oath. Did he well?

"Cranmer. I think not.

"Martin. So saith St. Ambrose *de officiis:* It is a miserable necessity, which is paid with parricide. Then, master Cranmer, you can no less confess, by the premises, but that you ought not to have conscience of every oath but if it be just, lawful, and advisedly taken.

"Cranmer. So was [1] that oath.

[1] His oath against the authority of the pope.

" Martin. That is not so. For, first, it was unjust; for it tended to the taking away of another man's right. It was not lawful; for the laws of God and the Church are against it. Besides, it was not voluntary; for every man and woman were compelled to take it.

" Cranmer. It pleaseth you to say so.

" Martin. Let all the world be judge. But, Sir, you that pretend to have such a conscience to break an oath, I pray you did you never swear and break the same?

" Cranmer. I remember not.

" Martin. I will help your memory. Did you never swear obedience to the see of Rome?

" Cranmer. Indeed I did once swear unto the same.

" Martin. Yea, that you did twice, as appeareth by records and writings here ready to be shewn.

" Cranmer. But, I remember, I saved all by protestation that I made by the counsel of the best-learned men I could get at that time.

" Martin. Hearken, good people, what this man saith. He made a protestation, one day, to keep never a whit of that, which he would swear, the next day. Was this the part of a Christian man? If a Christian man would bargain with a Turk, and, before he maketh his bargain solemnly, before witness readeth in his paper that he holdeth

secretly in his hand, or peradventure protesteth before [1] one or two, that he mindeth not to perform whatsoever he shall promise to the Turk; I say, if a Christian man would serve a Turk in this manner, that the Christian man were worse than the Turk. What would you then say to this man, that made a solemn oath and promise unto God and His Church, and made protestation before quite contrary?

"Cranmer. That which I did, I did by the best-learned men's advice I could get at that time.

"Martin. I protest before all the learned men here, that there is no learning will save your perjury herein. For there be two rules of the civil law against you:" (which he produced, and then turning to the audience said:) "But will you have the truth of the matter? King Henry even then meant the lamentable change, which after, you see, came to pass; and to further his pitiful proceedings, from the divorcement of his most lawful wife to the detestable departing from the blessed unity of Christ's Church, this man made the foresaid protestation; and, on the other side, he letted not to make [2] two solemn oaths quite contrary, and why? For otherwise, by the laws

[1] Not so. See the publicity of this transaction already related, vol. i. p. 60, seq.

[2] See before, vol. i. p. 62, seq.

and canons of this realm, he could not aspire to the archbishopric of Canterbury.

"Cranmer. I protest before you all, there was never man came more unwilling to a bishopric, than I did to that. Insomuch that, when king Henry did send for me in post that I should [1] come over, I prolonged my journey by seven weeks at the least, thinking that he would be forgetful of me in the mean time.

"Martin. You declare well by the way, that the king took you to be a man of good conscience, who could not find within all his realm [2] any men that would set forth his strange attempts, but was enforced to send for you in post to come out of Germany. What may we [3] conjecture hereby, but that there was a compact beween you, being then queen Anne (Boleyn's) chaplain, and the king: Give me the archbishopric of Canterbury, and I will give you licence to live in adultery.

"Cranmer. You say not true.

"Martin. Let your protestation, joined with the rest of your talk, give judgment. *Hinc prima mali labes.* Of that your execrable perjury, and his coloured and too shamefully suffered adultery, came heresy and all mischief to this realm. And thus have I spoken as touching the conscience you make for breaking your heretical oath to the king. But to break your former oath, made at

[1] From Germany. [2] See before, vol. i. p. 48.
[3] Ibid. n.

two sundry times both to God and His Church, you have no conscience at all. And now to answer another part of your oration, wherein you bring in God's Word that you have it on your side, and no man else, and that the pope hath devised a new scripture contrary to the Scriptures of God; you play herein as the Pharisees did, which cried always, *Verbum Domini, Verbum Domini*, the Word of the Lord, the Word of the Lord, when they meant nothing so. This bettereth not your cause, because you say you have God's Word for you; for so Basilides and Photinus the heretics said, that they had God's Word to maintain their heresy. So Nestorius, so Macedonius, so Pelagius, and, briefly, all the heretics that ever were, pretended that they had God's Word for them; yea, and so the devil, being the father of heresies, alleged God's Word for himself, saying, *Scriptum est*, It is written. So said he to Christ, *Mitte te deorsum*, Cast thyself downward, which you applied most falsely against the pope. But if you mark the [1] devil's language well, it agreed with your proceedings most truly. For *Mitte te deorsum*, cast thyself downward, said he, and so

[1] Either this diabolical eloquence of *casting down* was assumed by Martin in compliment to Gardiner, or Gardiner himself, unwilling to lose the merit of it, had desired the proctor now to introduce it; for it is almost word for word the same as Gardiner preached, and wished to apply in a similar manner, in 1539. See before, vol. i. p. 270.

taught you to cast all things downward; down with the sacrament, down with the mass, down with the altars, down with the arms of Christ, and up with a [1] lion and a dog; down with the abbies, down with chantries, down with hospitals and colleges, down with fasting and prayer, yea, down with all that good and godly is. All your proceeding, and preachings, tended to no other but to fulfil the devil's request, *Mitte te deorsum.* And therefore tell us not that you have God's Word. I would here ask but one question of you: Whether God's Word be contrary to itself, or no? For you, master Cranmer, have taught in this high sacrament of the altar three contrary doctrines, and yet you pretend in every one *Verbum Domini.*

"Cranmer. Nay, I taught but [2] two contrary doctrines in the same.

"Martin. What doctrine taught you, when you condemned Lambert the sacramentary in the king's presence in Whitehall?

"Cranmer. I maintained then the papists' doctrine.

"Martin. That is to say, the catholic and universal doctrine of Christ's Church. And how, when king Henry died? Did you not translate Justus Jonas' book?

[1] The king's arms, placed where the roods and roodlofts had been used to be.

[2] See before, vol. i. p. 266.

"Cranmer. [1] I did so.

"Martin. Then there you defended another doctrine touching the sacrament, by the same token that you sent to Lynne your printer, that whereas in the first print there was an affirmative, that is to say, Christ's body really in the sacrament, you sent then to your printer to put in a *not*, whereby it came miraculously to pass, that Christ's body was clean conveyed out of the sacrament.

"Cranmer. [2] I remember there were two printers of my said book, but where the same *not* was put in, I cannot tell.

"Martin. Then from a [3] Lutheran you became a [4] Zuinglian, which is the vilest heresy of all in the mystery of the sacrament; and for the same heresy you did help to burn Lambert the sacramentary, which you now call the Catholic faith and God's Word.

"Cranmer. I grant, that then I believed otherwise than I do now; and so I did, until my lord of London, Dr. Ridley, did confer with me, and by sundry persuasions and authorities of Doctors drew me quite from my opinion.

"Martin. Now, Sir, as touching the last part

[1] See before, vol. ii. p. 56. [2] Ibid. p. 57.

[3] See the various passages, which lead me to think that Cranmer never embraced the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation, in vol. i. pp. 265, 266. and vol. ii. pp. 52, 253, &c.

[4] As a Zuinglian, see what is said of him, vol. ii. p. 250, seq.

of your oration, you denied that the pope's holiness was the supreme head of the Church of Christ.

"Cranmer. I did so.

"Martin. Who, say you then, is supreme head?

"Cranmer. Christ.

"Martin. But whom hath Christ left here on earth his vicar and head of his Church?

"Cranmer. Nobody.

"Martin. Ah, why told you not king Henry this when you made him supreme head, and now nobody is? This is treason against his own person, as you then made him.

"Cranmer. I mean not but every king in his own realm and dominion is supreme head; and so was he supreme head of the Church of Christ in England.

"Martin. Is this always true? And was it ever so in Christ's Church?

"Cranmer. It was.

"Martin. Then what say you by Nero? He was the mightiest prince of the earth after Christ was ascended. Was he head of Christ's Church?

"Cranmer. Nero was Peter's head.

"Martin. I ask whether Nero was head of the Church or no? If he were not, it is false that you said before that all princes be, and ever were, heads of the Church within their realms.

"Cranmer. Nay, it is true. For Nero was

head of the Church, that is, in worldly respect of the temporal bodies of men, of whom the Church consisteth; for so he beheaded Peter and the Apostles. And the [1] Turk too is head of the Church in Turkey.

"Martin. Then he that beheaded the heads of the Church, and crucified the Apostles, was head of Christ's Church; and he, that was never member of the Church, is head of the Church by your new-found understanding of God's Word."

The impatience of the archbishop's adversaries, vexed as they must have been by some of his replies, now appears to have immediately demanded from him an answer to the formal interrogatories articulated against him. By the Romish reporter, as Foxe has copied them, these questions, together with the answers to them, were preserved, as they were delivered, in our own language. The official account of them to the cardinal de Puteo is in Latin; agreeing, in substance, with what the martyrologist has printed. Any material variation I have inserted in the notes below. The articles are in number sixteen.

I. [2] First it was objected, that he, being yet

[1] The official report sent to Rome, recites what here is said of Nero and the Turk.

[2] The proctor Martin's first article in the official report, after desiring it to be understood as the prefix to each question,

free, and before he entered into holy orders, married one Joan, surnamed Black, or Brown, dwelling at the sign of the dolphin in Cambridge.

Answer. Whereunto he answered, that whether she was called Black or Brown, he knew not, but that he married there one Joan, [1] that he granted.

II. That after the death of the foresaid wife, he entered into holy orders, and after that was made archbishop by the pope.

Answer. He received, he said, a certain bull of the pope, which he delivered unto the king, and was [made] archbishop by him.

III. That he, being in holy orders, married another woman as his second wife, named Anne, and so was twice married.

Answer. This he granted.

IV. In the time of king Henry, he kept the said wife secretly, and had [2] children by her.

Answer. This he also granted; affirming, that it was better for him to have his own, than to do like other priests, holding and keeping other men's wives.

V. In the time of king Edward, he brought out the said wife openly, affirming and professing publicly the same to be his wife.

is, *that Cranmer had been advanced to the see of Canterbury by the pope, and still considered himself archbishop.* The first marriage of Cranmer is then connected with this article.

[1] See before, vol. i. p. 6.

[2] The proctor says, *many* children: there were *three* only.

Answer. He denied not but so he did, and lawfully might do the same, forasmuch as the laws of the realm did so permit him.

VI. That he shamed not openly to glory himself to have had his wife in secret many years.

Answer. And though he did so, he said, there was no cause why he should be ashamed thereof.

VII. That, falling afterwards into the deep bottom of errors, he did fly and accuse the authority of the Church; did hold and follow the heresy concerning the sacrament of the altar; and also did compile, and cause so be set abroad,[1] divers books.

Answer. When the names of the books were recited to him, he denied not such books of which he was the true author. As touching the treatise of Peter Martyr upon the sacrament, he denied that he ever saw it before it was abroad, yet did approve and well like of the same. As for the Catechism, the book of Articles, with the other book against Winchester, he granted the same to [2] be his doings.

[1] The proctor thus recites them: "A defence of the true and catholic doctrine of the sacrament of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ, &c. A discourse upon the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, solemnly handled at the University of Oxford, by doctor Peter Martyr, &c. Catechismus brevis Christianæ disciplinæ, &c. Articuli de quibus in Synodo Londinensi, 1552, &c. An answer unto a crafty and sophistical cavillation devised by Stephen Gardiner," &c.

[2] In the official report. he admits the *defence* &c. to be his; denies the *discourse*, &c. to be so, but highly approves of it;

VIII. That he compelled many against their wills to subscribe to the same Articles.

Answer. He exhorted, he said, such as were willing to subscribe; but against their wills he [1] compelled none.

IX. Forasmuch as he surceased not to perpetrate [2] enorm and inordinate crimes, he was therefore cast into the Tower, and from thence was brought to Oxford, at what time it was commonly thought that the parliament there should be holden.

Answer. To this he said, that he knew no such enorm and inordinate crimes that ever he committed.

X. That in the said [3] city of Oxford he did openly maintain his heresy, and there was convicted upon the same.

Answer. He defended, he said, there the cause of the sacrament; but to be convicted in the same, that he denied.

as to the *Catechism* and *Articles* states only that he gave his advice as to the publishing them: "Quoad *Catechismum* et *Articulos* in eodem fatetur se adhibuisse ejus consilium circa editionem ejusdem;" and lastly owns *the answer to Gardiner.*

[1] "Ad octavum respondet se nunquam coegisse aliquos hujusmodi Articulis subscribere, tamen dicit *quòd plures clericorum provinciæ Cantuar' eisdem Articulis voluntariè subscripserunt,* quorum subscriptiones recepit, ut dicit." Proc. ut supr.

[2] "*Enormia, nefandaque* crimina, &c. (as alleged in the preceding articles.) The proctor's words, &c." Proc. ut supr.

[3] University. Proc. ut supr.

XI. When he persevered still in the same, he was by the public censure of the University pronounced a heretic, and his books to be heretical.

Answer. That he was so denounced, he denied not; but that he was a heretic, or his books heretical, that he denied.

XII. That he was, and is, notoriously infamed with the note of schism, as [one] who not only himself receded from the Catholic Church and see of Rome, but also moved the king and subjects of the realm to the same.

Answer. As touching the receding, that he well granted; but that receding or departing, said he, was only from the see of Rome, and had in it no matter of any schism.

XIII. That he had been twice sworn to the pope; (and Dr. Martin then brought out the [1] instrument of the public notary, wherein was contained his protestation, made when he should be consecrated, asking if he had any thing else protested.)

Answer. Whereunto he answered, that he [2] did nothing but by the laws of the realm.

XIV. That he did not only offend in the pre-

[1] See before, vol. i. p. 65, seq.

[2] The official report thus states the answer: "Fatetur se præstitisse juramentum obedientiæ prout continetur in scedula huic articulo annexa, tamen hæc fecit, ut asseruit, sub protestatione in instrumento publico, ut prefertur, in hac parte exhibito, contenta; et non aliter." Proc. ut supr.

mises, but also in taking upon him the authority of the see of Rome, in that without leave or licence from the said see he consecrated bishops and priests.

Answer. He granted that he did execute such things as were wont to be referred to the pope, at what time it was [1] permitted to him by the public laws and determination of the realm.

XV. That when the whole realm had subscribed to the authority of the pope, he only still persisted in his error.

Answer. [2] That he did not admit the pope's authority, he confessed to be true: but that he erred in the same, that he denied.

XVI. That all and singular the premises are true.

[1] "Fatetur se recessisse ab auctoritate Romani pontificis, et aliis sic recedere persuasit; hoc tamen, ut dicit, non fecit *ante legem inde factam auctoritate parliamenti Angliæ*; et etiam dicit, quòd post leges hujusmodi et earum auctoritate consecravit episcopos, et cetera fecit, quæ ante legem hujusmodi factam ad Romanum pontificem pertinebant, et quæ per ipsum Romanum pontificem fieri solebant." Proc. ut supr.

[2] The official report states that he courageously added, that before the late re-acknowledgment of the papal power the kingdom flourished, that he wished his country had not yielded to it, and that himself never would: "Ante reconciliationem nuperrimè in hoc Angliæ regno factam *hoc regnum in bono statu remansit, atque maximè optat quòd modò in eodem statu remaneret*; et fatebatur, ut prius, se recessisse ab auctoritate Romani pontificis, et quòd non intendit ad illam auctoritatem redire, vel eandem aliquo modo admittere." Proc. ut supr.

Answer. That likewise, he granted, excepting those things whereunto he had now answered.

The proctor Martin had procured eight witnesses to maintain the truth of these articles. But [1] before their depositions were given, other questions appear to have been urged, which drew from the archbishop a repetition of his unwillingness to accept the see of Canterbury, and, when the king had over-ruled it, of his determination not to receive the honour from the pontiff's hand; of his having made the protestation, which the king's civilians had recommended, against the papal authority, and of having caused that public act to be [2] enrolled in his archiepiscopal register.

Martin then seized the opportunity of introducing a subject which had recently been discussed in his name, the marriage of the clergy. He had published a book, of which [3] Gardiner was the principal writer, in order to render contemptible the married clergy, and to commend the royal [4] expulsion of them from their benefices. The

[1] Foxe. [2] See before, vol. i. p. 68.

[3] Ibid. p. 5. n. See also Burnet and Strype.

[4] Some thousands of men, women, and children, were thus reduced to beggary. The married priests, now expelled, have been reckoned by archbishop Parker at 12,000; he must have intended, perhaps, in so large a number, to include their families. Burnet enumerates the priests themselves at 3,000, Henry Wharton at about 1500.

marriage of Cranmer he now treated with new scorn. His children, [1] said he, were bondmen to the see of Canterbury. The remark called up a smile from the archbishop; who asked him if a priest at his benefice kept a concubine, and by her had bastards, whether they were bondmen to the benefice or no, sarcastically adding, "[2] I trust you will make my children's causes no worse." Other fond and foolish objections, says Foxe, were offered against him, with the repetition of which the martyrologist forbears to trouble the reader. Another tedious oration of Brookes, and a brief insulting address from Story to Cranmer, he copies however from the Romish reporter, who admits that Cranmer answered the man of office, but has suppressed his words.

The witnesses were then sworn to declare on the following day what they knew, or could remember, in regard to the present allegations. Their names were as follow, and their [3] depositions in the official report are according to this order of the names. Dr. Croke, Mr. Ward, Mr. Serles, Dr. Tresham, Mr. Curtopp, Mr. London, Dr. Smith, and Dr. Marshall. The substance of

[1] Foxe. [2] Foxe.

[3] These depositions were unknown to Foxe and Strype, and were first published from the Lambeth MS. at the close of Strype's Life of Cranmer, reprinted at the Clarendon Press, Oxford, in 1812, from the copy which I supplied.

these depositions I have gathered from the Latin report, as follows.

[1] RICHARD CROKE, doctor of divinity, of Cambridge, deposes that he had known Cranmer about thirty-six years; that the first nine articles he believes to be true upon general report; that he asserts the tenth to be true, as he was present at the disputation. Of the eleventh he says the same. The twelfth he admits to be true, except that he cannot affirm of his own knowledge, though he had heard it said, that Cranmer compelled any to renounce the papal authority. He had heard Cranmer say, what the thirteenth alleges, that at his consecration he had taken the oath of obedience to the pope, but he offers nothing as to the protestation, "*aliter nescit deponere in articulo predicto.*" That Cranmer consecrated bishops, as Ponet, Coverdale, Hooper, Ridley, &c. which is the substance of the fourteenth article, he affirms; and, in regard to the fifteenth, that he had heard Cranmer publicly speaking in detestation of the papal authority. The last article he, and the rest of the witnesses, consider as the general opinion.

[2] ROBERT WARD, master of arts, of Merton

[1] He who had been public orator, and succeeded Erasmus as Greek professor at Cambridge, (as it should seem,) but now resided at Oxford. See A. Wood, Ath. Ox.

[2] See before, in this vol. p. 47.

College, Oxford, had known the archbishop about twelve years. To the first six articles he deposes, that he believes them upon general report to be true; that as to the seventh, he considers Cranmer of himself not sufficiently learned to have composed the books in question, although he knows that the archbishop avowed and circulated all or most of them as his own, and had defended at the public disputations in Oxford the heresies contained in them. The eighth he believes to be true upon report. The ninth he affirms in part to be so, because he saw the archbishop when he was brought from the Tower to Oxford; and the rest he believes to be so. The tenth and the eleventh he knows to be true, being present on both occasions. To the twelfth he assents upon report. To the thirteenth absolutely, as he saw the public instrument or protestation. The fourteenth he affirms to be true, adding Taylor and Holbeach to the other prelates consecrated by Cranmer; and the fifteenth also to be so, because no later than the day before this deposition he had heard the archbishop disdaining the authority of the pontiff, and declaring he would on no account acknowledge it.

[1] ROBERT SERLES, bachelor of divinity, of Oxford,

[1] "The same, I suppose, who belonged to the church of Canterbury, and had been among the number of the conspirators against him in king Henry's days." Strype. See before, vol. i. p. 348.

had known the archbishop about twenty years. He believes the first nine articles to be true, because he had heard they were so. The tenth and eleventh too he believes, not because he was present on the occasions, but because others told him so. As to the twelfth, he considers the archbishop a notorious schismatic and heretic, because he had often heard him uttering and defending heresies; and that, when the Church of England renounced the papal authority, himself as vicar of Lenham in Cranmer's diocese was led or rather forced to renounce it; that from his office in the cathedral of Canterbury as one of the six preachers he had been expelled, because he affirmed the corporal presence, and had refused to subscribe to certain articles made public by the archbishop; and that by his order he had been twice imprisoned. The thirteenth article he believes on report. He says that Cranmer acted as the fourteenth describes him. To the fifteenth he deposes, that on the preceding day, he had heard the archbishop so disclaiming the power of the pope.

[1] WILLIAM TRESHAM, doctor of divinity, canon of Christ Church, Oxford, had known the archbishop twenty years. The first six articles he

[1] He had been one of the disputants against Cranmer, and in his zeal absurdly pretended that in Cranmer's book on the sacrament were 600 errors. Foxe. Strype

believes upon report to be true. To the seventh he deposes, that Cranmer published his *defence of the true doctrine*, &c. and his *answer to Gardiner;* and that he [1] advised the publication of the book called the *Catechism.* To the eighth he offers no deposition. The ninth he simply affirms, of his own knowledge, to be true. To the tenth and eleventh he deposes, that he was present on both occasions, that the archbishop was confuted in the disputations, and convicted of heresy. The twelfth he considers to be true, except that he knows of no compulsion used by the archbishop. The thirteenth he asserts to be true, and that he had heard the archbishop confess before the delegate bishop Brookes that he had taken the oath of obedience to the pope, but also with the protestation recited in the public instrument. To the fourteenth and fifteenth he deposes, that those articles he believes to be true, with a repetition of his exception that Cranmer used no compulsion in obtaining assent to them.

[2] JAMES CURTOPP, master of arts, and dean of Peterborough, who does not say how long he had known the archbishop, deposes that the first and second articles, as he had heard, were correct;

[1] "Atque etiam deponit quòd idem Thomas Cranmerus *ejus consilium adhibuit* circa editionem libri vocat' Catechism?" Proc. ut supr.

[2] "He had been formerly a great hearer of Peter Martyr." Strype.

that, in regard to the third, he had also heard it said that Cranmer had married a second wife, but that he knew not whether he was really married to the lady; that, however, he had seen her at the archbishop's table, acknowledged in her matronly character; to the fourth and fifth also deposing that he had heard of the archbishop's concealment of her in the time of Mary; but that he knew of her being publicly acknowledged in the time of Edward. The sixth he believes to be true, and adds that Cranmer told him, Osiander married them. Of his own knowledge, as to the seventh article, he affirms that Cranmer published his *defence*, &c. the *Catechism*, the *Articles* with the Catechism, and the *answer to Gardiner*. To the eighth he offers nothing. To the ninth, tenth, and eleventh, he deposes, he had heard that the allegations were correct: To the twelfth, that he knows it to be so, except that he releases the archbishop from the charge of using compulsion. The thirteenth he affirms to be true, and that he had heard Cranmer admitting before Brookes his oath of obedience to the pope. Of the fourteenth and fifteenth he also admits the truth, except again that he knew of no compulsion employed by the archbishop.

[1] GEORGE LONDON, bachelor of divinity, of Gloucester Hall, Oxford, had known the archbishop

[1] "A relation, I suppose, of Dr. London, who came to shame for his false accusation of Cranmer and others in king

fifteen years. He affirms the first six articles to be true upon Cranmer's own admission in effect, as he says, before Brookes, and upon general belief. To the seventh he deposes that Cranmer published the *defence*, &c. and the *answer to Gardiner*, and advised (as before the delegate also he confessed) the publication of the *Catechism*. As to the eighth, he is silent. The ninth, tenth, and eleventh, he believes to be true, but was not present when the archbishop was pronounced a heretic, and his books heretical. In conformity to the twelfth he pronounces him a schismatic, and says that the archbishop also advised king Henry, as well as many other persons, to recede from the papal authority. The fourteenth and fifteenth he affirms, of his own knowledge, to be true.

[1] RICHARD SMITH, doctor of divinity, canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and now again the regius professor of divinity in the University, had known Cranmer about eighteen years. The first six articles he affirms to be true, partly, as he had often heard from others, partly as he knew

Henry's reign; and now was willing, 'tis like, to be even with Cranmer, for his relation's sake.

[1] Now restored to the professorship he had "deserted," as A. Wood informs us, Ann. Univ. Ox. See also before, in the present vol. p. 172. Cranmer had in former days accepted his recantation, and been a friend to him. He has been already often noticed in this Life of Cranmer.

himself. To the seventh he deposes, that Cranmer published the *defence of the true and catholic doctrine of the sacrament,* &c. and that himself answered it in a book, entitled *a confutation of the true and catholic doctrine,* &c. and as to the *Catechism,* and the *Articles* annexed to it, as well as to the *answer of the archbishop to Gardiner,* Cranmer's own admission, he says, as well as public belief, attests the truth of this article. To the eighth and ninth he deposes nothing. The tenth and eleventh he affirms to be true, as having been present at the disputation, and at the conviction of the archbishop. The rest of the articles he believes, upon the report of others, to be true.

[1] RICHARD MARSHALL, doctor of divinity, and dean of Christ Church, Oxford, had known Cranmer about sixteen years. The first six articles he considers to be true from the archbishop's own admission, as he says, on the preceding day. In regard to the seventh, this witness pronounces Peter Martyr's *discourse of the true and catholic faith,* as well as the *answer to Gardiner,* and the Catechism with the annexed *Articles,* to be the works of the archbishop, by himself admitted, (this witness ought to have said, by himself denied,)

[1] A most furious man now against the Reformation, as Strype records him; but, like Smith, he changed his religion two or three times, yet at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign was, in consequence of indiscreet behaviour, deprived of his deanery. A. Wood, Ann. Univ. Ox.

and generally received, as such. The eighth and ninth he believes to be true, because it was said by some that their subscription was not voluntary, and that such was common report. The tenth and eleventh, being present on the occasions, (as the preceding witness was,) he pronounces correct. The rest partly upon report, partly upon the archbishop's own admission, he believes to be true.

The proctor Story, who on the preceding day had [1] haughtily interrupted him in his defence, now told the archbishop, that he might offer his exceptions against any of the witnesses. Cranmer replied, [2] that he excepted against all of them, as persons who were perjured, who had before sworn against the pope, and now acknowledged and defended him. The contradictions in some of the

[1] Foxe. Story, it may be added, appears to have been a man of savage character. "He was a great instrument," says Heylin, (Hist. Ref. Eliz. 107.) "of Bonner's butcheries; and, being questioned for the cruelty of his executions, appeared so far from being sensible of any error which he then committed, as to declare himself to be sorry for nothing more, than that instead of lopping off some few boughs and branches, he did not lay his axe to the root of the tree; and though it was not hard to guess at how high a mark the wretch's malice seemed to aim, and what he meant by laying his axe to the root of the tree, yet passed he unpunished for the present, though divine vengeance brought him in conclusion to his just reward."—He had, in Mary's time, advised "the cutting off of queen Elizabeth." Burnet. He was executed as a traitor in 1571. Burnet. Heylin. A. Wood.

[2] Foxe. Burnet. Strype.

depositions, he forbore to censure, and the session closed. Nor was it re-opened, till after the sentence against him was received from Rome. "[1] The provisions of the canon law," Dr. Lingard says, "were *scrupulously* observed; Cranmer underwent two examinations, and was [2] then served, as a matter of form, with a citation to answer before the pontiff in the course of eighty days: He owed *this distinction* to his dignity of archbishop, and to his ordination, which had been performed according to the ancient pontifical." The reader will be at no loss to appreciate the distinction, and this narrative of the *scrupulous* bestowal of it, when he is assured, that notwithstanding the archbishop professed his readiness to go to Rome, it had been resolved that he should never more behold any other city than that in which he was confined. This [3] mockery the historian has prudently concealed.

To the same *scrupulosity* the inferior rank of his companions, Latimer and Ridley, did not entitle them. On the 30th of September having been re-examined before Brookes and other commis-

[1] Hist. Eng. 8vo. vii. 272.

[2] But he was first served with the citation on the opening of the commission, Sept. 9.

[3] "Their holy one of Rome, (the pope,) burnt that most reverend father Dr. Cranmer at Rome *in a mummery*, before he ever saw him, or heard him speak, &c." Bishop Jewell, Repl. to Hardinge, 1565, p. 482.

sioners, and in vain pressed to recant their opinions, they were therefore on the next day condemned, and fifteen days after led to the stake, where Latimer cheered his fellow-sufferer in the memorable words, "*Be of good comfort; we shall this day light such a candle in England, as I trust, by God's grace, will never be put out.*" In their way to it, they passed near Bocardo, Cranmer's prison, when Ridley looked up to the window of it, says Foxe, under the hope of seeing him there, and of receiving his last farewell; "but Cranmer was then busy with friar Soto and his fellows, disputing together, so that he could not see him through that occasion." Other writers relate, that Cranmer from the top of his prison beheld the execution of his friends; that he prayed for strength from heaven to support their faith and hope; and that when his end, like their's, which he expected, should arrive, for similar succour to his own. Archbishop Parker is the first that mentions this historical variation, and is followed by Godwin, Heylin, and Burnet; by Wood the Oxford antiquary also, not without some local particulars of the martyrdom. "[1] Ridley and Latimer were brought to the place," he says, "where they were to be burnt, that is to say, over against Balliol College, where now [namely, when the Oxford antiquary wrote, more than a century

[1] Annals, Univ. Ox. under the year 1555.

since,] stand a row of poor cottages, a little behind which, before this time, ran so clear a stream under the town-wall, that it gave the name of Canditch (*candida fossa*) to the way leading by it, and by that name it is known to this day; there, I say, being brought, they suffered death with courage for the religion they professed, in the presence of the chief magistrates of the University and City, with multitudes of scholars and laics. Cranmer, at that time being in Bocardo, [1] ascended to the top thereof to see the spectacle, and kneeling down prayed to God to strengthen them."

Dr. Lingard augments the preceding narratives. He tells us, that at the dismal sight "[2] Cranmer's resolution began to waver, and he let fall some hints of a willingness to relent, and of a desire to confer with the legate," cardinal Pole. These hints, however, are nothing more than a communication of the cardinal to Philip, [3] that Cranmer was less pertinacious than usual, and had expressed a wish to speak with him; that [4] great hope was entertained

[1] The Bocardo prison was over the north gate of the city, and at a very little distance from the place of the execution. It was taken down in the year 1771.

[2] Hist. Eng. 8vo. vii. 273.

[3] "Is non ita se pertinacem ostendit, aitque se cupere mecum loqui." Pole to Philip, v. 47. Lingard.

[4] "Magnam spem initio dederat, eique veniam Polus ab

of his recantation, according to a biographer of Pole, and that the queen allowed the conference which he sought. But with the cardinal Cranmer did not converse; nor in letters is there any evidence of this pretended *wavering*. The archbishop as yet was firm. He had written, in his defence, a long [1]letter to the queen, (recapitulating his former arguments both against the papal supremacy and the papal doctrine,) which Pole was desired by Mary to answer; and his reply, ere three weeks had passed since the martyrdom of Ridley and Latimer, abundantly contradicts the belief, and the hope, of the archbishop's willingness now to relent. The cardinal still [2] reproaches him as grossly ignorant as well as incurably obstinate, and insolently bids him have recourse to self-condemnation. The cardinal had been misinformed, when he wrote to Philip, by persons who chose to represent the general mildness of Cranmer as a submission to their views. It was in the same spirit, but with the same disappointment,

ipsa regina impetraverat." Dudith. inter ep. Poli, i. 143. Lingard.

[1] First printed by Foxe.

[2] The letter is dated Nov. 6. Strype, Append. No. 89. Pole had before written a very insulting letter to Cranmer, which Burnet has noticed, and Le Grand translated into French, but by the former historian was deemed too worthless to be copied.

that Bonner, when Cranmer was first summoned before Mary's Council, said, " [1] Mr. Canterbury is become very humble, and ready to submit himself in all things."

[1] Burnet, ii. Rec. P. ii. B. 2. No. 7.

CHAPTER V.

1555 to 1556.

The archbishop deprived and degraded—He recants—His recantations.

THE eighty days, which had been allowed for Cranmer's appearance at Rome, had no sooner elapsed, than cardinal de Puteo bade the royal proctors of the pontifical court demand judgment. [1] On the 4th of December, the pope accordingly pronounced and decreed him to be found guilty of the crime of heresy and other excesses, as Brookes had detailed them in his official report; of having opposed the traditions of the Church of Rome and the rites she used, especially in regard to the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, and to holy orders; of having forbidden processions that were wont to be celebrated by the pontiff's predecessors; of having denied the papal authority; of having espoused the false and heretical doctrines of Wicliffe and Luther; of having,

[1] Foxe. Strype. Burnet.

in defence of those doctrines, printed several books, and maintained public disputations; and therefore sentenced him to be excommunicated and deprived, to be degraded and delivered up to the secular power. Bonner, bishop of London, and Thirlby, bishop of Ely, were appointed to execute this decree; the former had been long his enemy, the latter his friend and chaplain.

The papal condemnation was dated December the fourteenth, and transmitted to England. On the 14th of February Thirlby and Bonner, who had come down to Oxford, cited the archbishop before them in the choir of the cathedral of Christ-Church, and there stated, according to the tenor of their commission, that he had [1] *taken no care to appear at Rome*, that witnesses and counsel however as well for as against him had been there heard and examined, and that he had wanted nothing necessary to his defence, but that having refused to be present at those proceedings he was pronounced *contumacious*. The archbishop could not hear such a recital without indignantly replying, that [2] when he was continually in prison, and could never be suffered even in his own country to have the advantage of a public advocate, how false it was to aver that at Rome he

[1] "Comparere non curaret," are the words in the papal instrument, intended to signify, as Strype observes, an aggravation of his crime. Wilkins, Conc. iv. 133.

[2] Foxe. Strype.

should have produced witnesses and appointed counsel. "God must needs punish," he added, "this open and shameless lying."

The form of degradation now proceeded. The dresses of the clergy of the Church of Rome, through all their ranks from ordination to the prelatical dignity, were produced. Attired in each of the subordinate habiliments for a moment, he was [1] successively degraded from the character which each of them distinguished. The archiepiscopal robes, however, were in derision, made of [2] canvass; the mitre, and the pall, of materials as worthless; and what seemed a crosier was placed in his hand. Bonner, when he saw him treated with this last indignity, thus exultingly bade the audience observe him. "[3] This is the man," said he, "who has ever despised the pope's holiness, and now is to be judged by him. This is the man who hath pulled down so many churches, and now is come to be judged in a church. This is the man that contemned the blessed sacrament of the altar, and now is come to be condemned before that blessed sacrament hanging over the altar. This is the man that like Lucifer sate in the place of Christ upon an altar to judge another, and now is come before an altar to be judged himself." Cranmer here interrupted the orator,

[1] Wilkins, Conc. iv. 135, seq.

[2] Foxe. Strype. [3] Ibid.

denying generally his charges, but answering in particular the last which he thus explained; "That which you here mean was in the church of St. Paul, where I came to sit in commission, a scaffold being prepared for me and others *by you and your officers;* but whether under it there was an altar I neither perceived, nor once suspected; and therefore you unjustly accuse me." Bonner then returned to his railing, till at length all were weary of it. Repeatedly by his fellow-commissioner Thirlby was he gently interrupted as he scolded, and afterwards reproached with having violated the promise he had made of treating the archbishop at least with common respect. The staff was now about to be taken from Cranmer's hands, according to the form of degradation. He refused as yet to part with it. Drawing from his sleeve a written appeal, after the example of Luther who had appealed first to the papal delegate, next to the pontiff himself, and afterwards to a general council, he then handed up his paper to Thirlby, and desired the by-standers to be witnesses, that to the next general council he also appealed. He assigned [1] six reasons for so doing. 1. Being cited to Rome, he says, he was kept in most strict confinement, so that he could in no wise be suffered to go thither, nor to come out of prison; that, in so important causes con-

[1] Foxe.

cerning estate and life, no man is bound to send a proctor; that though he would never so fain have sent his proctor, yet by reason of his poverty he was not able, (for all that ever he had, with which he might bear a proctor's costs, was taken from him;) and that whether he appeared or not, the cardinal de Puteo had declared the intention to proceed in judgment against him. 2. That being cited to appear at home before the cardinal's delegate, bishop Brookes, he had been denied what was necessary for his defence, the aid of counsel. 3. That he had not received from the royal proctors, as it was promised that he should, copies of his answers for amendment, if requisite, to the charges produced against him. 4. That he disowned the papal authority, as well in consequence of his oath against it, as of its discordance with the English constitution. 5. That the usurped authority of the pontiff had consumed the riches and substance of the realm. 6. That it had not only caused the national laws and customs to be trodden under foot, but also to the decrees of councils and to the precepts of the Gospel was repugnant. He concluded with solemnly declaring, "that *in all his doctrine and preaching, both of the sacrament and whatever else it might be*, he meant and judged those things, as the Catholic Church and the most holy Fathers of old with one accord have meant and judged."

Such was the substance of his appeal, not

indeed recited by him before the commissioners, but as it was received in writing by Thirlby, after [1] having the power of proceeding without such benignant attention. Mindful of the kindnesses received in former days from Cranmer, this prelate also now assured him, that if he would recant, he would be a suitor for him to the king and queen, whose express command had imposed upon him the present melancholy office. Thirlby's heart indeed appears to have been wrung with distress at the scene before him, and he wept. The gentle spirit of the archbishop was gratified; and he bade his friend suppress his sorrow, as himself suppressed concern. The [2] degradation proceeded. The vesture, representing the archiepiscopal pall, was next to be stripped off. Then, indeed, correctly implying that inferior prelates could not degrade an archbishop, he said, "Which of you hath a pall, to take off my pall?" They answered, that as the pontiff's delegates, not as bishops, they were competent to the ceremony; which being performed, a barber then clipped the

[1] "Our commission is to proceed against you," said Thirlby to Cranmer, "*omni appellatione remota*:—but, if it may be admitted, it shall; and so received it of him." Foxe. But the admission was of no service to the archbishop.

[2] The minute and long account of Cranmer's degradation, directed by the papal bull, and another account of this Romish form in the instance of Dr. Castellane, Foxe has printed. Wilkins has copied the former. Concil. iv. 134, seq.

hair round his head, and Bonner scraped the tops of his fingers where they had been anointed, again conducting himself with studied insolence, while Thirlby apparently was all compassion. The pageant of the degradation ended with exhibiting the archbishop only in his jacket, over which was then thrown the threadbare gown of a yeoman bedel, and on his head was placed a townsman's cap. "Now you are no longer a lord," exclaimed Bonner sarcastically to the victim; and to the beholders, "See here this gentleman?"

In this garb he was led, pitied by all but Bonner, to his prison. On his way thither he was attended by a gentleman of Gloucestershire, who, on beholding him deprived of his clerical gown, had managed to obtain that part of his dress, and now wished to deliver it to him. The stranger seems to have been indebted to [1] Thirlby for this power of restitution. He alluded, in the conversation with the archbishop, to the friendship that Thirlby had expressed; when Cranmer replied, "He might have used a great deal more, and never have been the worse thought of; for I have [2] well deserved it." Arrived at the prison, the

[1] "He (the gentleman) standing by, and being thought to be toward one of the bishops, had it delivered to him; who, by the way talking with Cranmer, said, "The bishop of Ely protested his friendship with tears." Foxe.

[2] Thirlby had been promoted through his means. See before, vol. i. p. 167. Morice, the archbishop's secretary, has left a

stranger took not leave of the archbishop without asking him if he wished for any assistance or refreshment. "I would willingly eat something," was the reply; "for, having been troubled with the prospect of that day's business, I had little inclination to eat till all might be over; but all is over now, and my heart is quieted." The stranger's purse was then offered, for in that of Cranmer not a single penny remained. It was offered, however, with caution. The gentleman was not ignorant of proceedings against such, as had formerly afforded pecuniary relief to heretics. He consigned to the bailiffs, therefore, his kind supply for the archbishop; expressed his belief, that as good men they would carefully bestow it on him; and then bade the prisoner farewell, commending to his prayers himself and all his friends. Ere night approached, his charity however became known to Thirlby and Bonner. He was in consequence reprimanded, and with difficulty escaped being sent in custody to Mary's Council; "such was the cruelty and iniquity of

letter relating almost wholly to "the gentill archbyshop's liberality in various respects" to this prelate, "whether it were juell, plate, instrument, mapps, horse, or any thing else, &c." Harl. MSS. 416. fol. 183. "Wherefore," he adds, "if D. Thirlby did not to his utterm[illegible] power practize to have saved his lyfe, he not onlie did him moche wrong, but also abused his singular benevolence with overmoche ingratitude."

the time," says Foxe, "that men could not do good without punishment."

It was of no avail that Cranmer had addressed a [1] letter to the queen, stating the same objections to the proceedings in September, as were now contained in his appeal. The resolution of Mary was not to be changed. In vain had a printed [2] petition from abroad been sent to her, in 1555, to implore her order to discontinue persecution; in vain did it remind her, that in her father's time Cranmer had [3] preserved her, and that to him therefore her mercy was a debt of gratitude.

The sentence of the ecclesiastical court now remained to be executed by the secular power. But ere the order was issued to this purpose, (and [4] few days only passed before it was issued,) another trial of his constancy was made, and he sunk under it. With expressions of pity for his situation, but with the design of leading him to recant, some of the principal academics seem to have immediately visited him in prison. He, whose deposition is the last of those who were

[1] Foxe. [2] Strype.

[3] See before, p. 331.

[4] The royal order for the writ to burn him was dated February 24. Burnet and Wilkins. Concil. iv. 140. The mayor and bailiffs of Oxford, to whom it was directed, would receive it perhaps, two or three days afterwards.

[1] witnesses against him, is now said to have invited the archbishop to his deanery at Christ-Church; but the invitation could not have been accepted till after the 16th of February, as on that day one of his recantations is signed, which appears to have been delivered, as a preceding recantation was, *to Bonner personally in the Bocardo prison.* These, in Bonner's narrative of all the submissions that Cranmer made, are the third and fourth. The first and second will shew how the archbishop hesitated ere he fell. Perhaps they were proposed by Thirlby. Before the proceedings on the 14th had ended, they could not have been made. The language of Cranmer we have seen, was then undauntedly opposed to them. He probably listened, at the close of that day, to the persuasions of his friend, and signed what by him was hoped might propitiate the queen, of which the copy being seen by others, after it had been dispatched, it was considered not sufficiently explicit, and therefore was followed by the second, without delay we may suppose, retracting what is said in the first. It is remarkable, however,

[1] Dr. Marshall. See before, p. 455. He had been employed, in his younger days, to seduce our celebrated bishop Jewell, into a temporary submission to the Romish Church. Humphry, Vit. Juelli, 1573. p. 81. Anthony Wood, as well as Dr. Humphry, give a miserable character of this distinguished ecclesiastic.

that neither of them is dated. They are in Bonner's narrative thus given.

I. "[1] *The true copy of the first submission of Thomas Cranmer, late archbishop of Canterbury, which afterward by inconstancy and unstableness he the said Thomas Cranmer did cancel, the original whereof was sent to the queen's Majesty and her Privy Council, as followeth.*

"Forasmuch as the king and queen's Majesties, by consent of their parliament, have received the pope's authority within this realm, I am content to submit myself to their laws herein, and to take the pope to be the chief head of this Church of England, so far as God's laws and the laws and customs of this realm will permit.

"THOMAS CRANMER."

II. "[2] *The true copy of the second submission of the said Thomas Cranmer, which he the said Thomas did advisedly subscribe with his own hand, and did not afterwards revoke it, the original whereof was also sent up to the queen's Majesty and her said Council, as before.*

[1] "All the submyssyons and recantations of Thomas Cranmer, late archbyshop of Canterburye, truely set forth both in Latyn and Englysh, agreable to the originalles, wrytten and subscribed with his own handes. *Visum et examinatum per reverendum patrem et dominum, dominum Edmundum episcopum London.* Anno 1556." Sign. A. 2. a. [2] Ibid.

"I Thomas Cranmer, doctor in divinity, do submit myself to the Catholic Church of Christ, and to the pope, supreme head of the same Church, and unto the king and the queen's Majesties, and unto all their laws and ordinances.

"THOMAS CRANMER."

The third and fourth submissions are preceded by a [1] Latin notification, that they were presented to Bonner by Cranmer in Bocardo. Of these the first is not dated; and the second, which wants not such a mark of genuineness, can hardly be named a recantation, being no more than an avowal that in his religious belief he was guided by antiquity.

III. "I am content to submit myself to the king and queen's Majesties, and to all their laws and ordinances, as well concerning the pope's supremacy as others. And I shall from time to time move and stir all other to do the like, to the uttermost of my power; and to live in quietness and obedience unto their Majesties, most humbly, without murmur or grudging against any of their godly proceedings. And for my book which I have written, I am contented to submit me to the

[1] Viz. "Tertium scriptum Cranmeri sua ipsius manu exaratum, et per eum in Buccardo exhibitum London. episcopo." The prefix to the fourth is the same. Sign. A. 2. b.

judgment of the Catholic Church, and of the next general council.

"THOMAS CRANMER.

IV. "[1] Be it known by these presents, that I Thomas Cranmer, doctor in divinity, and late archbishop of Canterbury, do firmly, stedfastly, and assuredly, believe in all articles and points of the Christian religion and Catholic faith, as the Catholic Church doth believe, and hath ever believed from the beginning. Moreover, as concerning the sacraments of the Church, I believe unfeignedly in all points as the said Catholic Church doth and hath believed from the beginning of Christian religion. In witness whereof I have humbly subscribed my hand unto these presents, the 16th day of February, 1555-6.

"THOMAS CRANMER."

These papers, as might be expected, were not sufficient to satisfy the Romish party. Other concessions must be obtained from their great opponent, they said, by intimidation as well as by artful proposals, and by insidious suggestions. It was immediately after the fourth recantation, I have no doubt, that to the deanery of Christ Church he was conducted for the visit of a few days to partake of a treacherous hospitality; that there the Spanish friar, John de Villa Garcina, then the regius professor of divinity at

[1] Ibid.

Oxford, and [1] Henry Sydall, a canon in the dean's cathedral, were the principal managers of the allurements, and the threats, by which themselves and other Romanists at length subdued him to their purpose. To the king and queen his absolute recantation, these egregious tempters urged, would be highly acceptable. Nor to the lords of

[1] "A very inconstant man in religion," says Anthony Wood, who is never very friendly, however, to Cranmer's memory. He is speaking of De Villa Garcina as the person who, "with Sydall," whom he characterises, "endeavoured to *persuade* archbishop Cranmer to recant when he was condemned to be burnt." Ann. Univ. Ox. Divinity Professors. Foxe was not the sole authority for this assertion. The old chronicler Grafton also tells that "by the *persuasion* of friar John, and by the *counsel* of certain others *that put him in hope of life and pardon*, Cranmer subscribed a recantation, &c." Dr. Humphry gives a similar account. But because the archbishop, when in his last speech he revoked his recantations, declared that he had signed them from a wish to save his life if it might be; therefore some have denied that he had been seduced, or persuaded, by others so to do. Let such call to mind how Brookes at the trial opened the battery of seduction against him; (see before, p. 425.) "*you need not to doubt*," he added, to the then unshaken prisoner, that "*after your return*" to the Church of Rome, "*you shall be as well still, yea, and rather better*" than when you were archbishop. The particulars related by the archbishop's contemporaries, Dr. Humphry, Foxe, and Grafton the chronicler, are admitted by the antiquary Wood, by the historian Collier, by the biographer Strype, all of whom believed the endeavours used by his tempters to excite in him *the hope of life*, although they could not *promise* the fulfilment of the hope.

the Council and other noblemen, they added, who much respected him, could it be less so. They put him in hope that not only his life might be spared, but that his former dignity might be restored; saying that for such boons it was but a small and easy matter they required of him, his subscription only to a few words in "[1] a little leaf of paper," with his own hand; and that then, whether he would have rank and wealth, or would prefer the quietness of private life, his choice might be secured by the regal power; but that, if he refused, of pardon there was no hope; *for the queen was so purposed that she would have Cranmer a Roman Catholic, or else no Cranmer at all.*

To these artifices he yielded; and to the words, *on the little leaf of paper* which they brought, subscribed, as it should seem, in their presence. "This recantation," says Foxe, "was not so soon conceived, but the doctors and prelates, without delay, caused the same to be imprinted and set abroad in all men's hands. Whereunto, *for better credit*, first was added the name of Thomas Cranmer, with a solemn subscription; then followed the witnesses, Henry Sydall, and John de Villa Garcina." The Privy Council were displeased at the hasty publication of this paper, and the two printers of it were commanded to

[1] Foxe.

deliver all the copies to be burned. It was reserved to be the fifth recantation in Bonner's account, where it appears in Latin, bearing however an English title, and has been translated by Foxe as follows.

V. " [1] *The true copy of a fifth submission of the said Thomas Cranmer, written and subscribed with his own hand, in the presence of master Henry Sydall, and of one called Frater Johannes de Villa Garcina, a notable learned man, as followeth.*

" I Thomas Cranmer, late archbishop of Canterbury, do renounce, abhor, and detest, all manner of heresies and errors of Luther and Zuinglius, and all other teachings which are contrary to sound and true doctrines. And I believe most constantly in my heart, and with my mouth I confess, one holy and Catholic Church visible, without the which there is no salvation, and thereof I acknowledge the bishop of Rome to be supreme head in earth, whom I acknowledge to be the highest bishop and pope, and Christ's vicar, unto whom all Christian people ought to be subject. And as concerning the sacraments, I believe and worship in the sacrament of the altar the very body and blood of Christ, being contained most truly under the forms of bread and wine, the bread through the mighty power of God

[1] All the submyssyons, ut supr. sign. A. 3 a.

being turned into the body of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and the wine into his blood. And in the other six sacraments also, like as in this, I believe and hold as the Universal Church holdeth, and the Church of Rome judgeth and determineth. Furthermore, I believe that there is a place of purgatory, where souls departed are punished for a time, for whom the Church doth godlily and wholesomely pray, like as it doth honour saints and maketh prayers to them. Finally, in all things I profess, that I do not otherwise believe than the Catholic Church, and the Church of Rome, holdeth and teacheth. I am sorry that I ever held or thought otherwise. And I beseech Almighty God, that of His mercy He will vouchsafe to forgive me whatsoever I have offended against God or His Church; and also I desire and beseech all Christian people to pray for me. And all such as have been deceived either by my example or doctrine, I require them by the blood of Jesus Christ that they will return to the unity of the Church, that we may be all of one mind without schism or division. And to conclude, as I submit myself to the Catholic Church of Christ, and to the supreme head thereof, so I submit myself unto the most excellent majesties of Philip and Mary, king and queen of this realm of England, &c. and to all their laws and ordinances, being ready always as a faithful subject ever to obey them. And God is my witness, that I have

not done this for favour or fear of any person, but willingly, and of my own mind, as well to the discharge of my own conscience as to the instruction of others.

"Per me THOMAM CRANMER.

"*Witnesses to this subscription* { "Frater JOHANNES DE VILLA GARCINA. "HENRICUS SYDALL."

To this recantation there is no date. But it was probably made immediately after the writ for burning him had been sent to Oxford, as Noailles, the French ambassador to Mary, (whose character for veracity however is not spotless,) mentions to his court, [1] that with this fifth paper Cranmer sent a letter to Pole, begging the respite of a few days, that he might yet give to the world a more convincing proof of his repentance. Mary is said to have "[2] cheerfully" granted what Cranmer asked; but, determined not to spare him, she only ordered the day of his approaching fate to be concealed from him. Meantime the sixth recantation was prepared. To a more laboured disavowal (more complete it could not be than what the fifth recites) of tenets he had maintained, to louder cries for mercy, to deeper expressions of self-abasement, he was now to be earnestly pressed under the fallacious persuasion that from the terror of the stake he might be wholly freed.

[1] Lingard, Hist. Eng. 8vo. vii. 276. [2] Ibid.

That this outrageous composition was drawn up by Pole, Strype long since assumed by comparing it with the tedious prolixity and style of the recantation, which the cardinal prepared for the friend of Cranmer, Sir John Cheke. That there is further reason to believe Pole the composer, the recent author of the History of the Reformation collects from "[1] the identity of the ideas, and even of the language, with those which we read in his letter to Cranmer, of which the original is among the Harleian manuscripts, and a French translation in Le Grand, and in Pole's epistles." It was printed in Latin, with the signature indeed of the archbishop, but not with that of witnesses. Strype has thus translated it. But to this as to the preceding recantation, which is very remarkable, is prefixed an English title.

"[2] *The true copy of a sixth submission of the said Thomas Cranmer, written and subscribed with his own hand, as followeth.*

"I Thomas Cranmer, late archbishop of Can-

[1] Soames, iv. 525. n. In another letter from Pole to the archbishop there are sentiments according with parts of this submission. The sermon also of Cole, which, by the desire of the cardinal, he preached at Cranmer's execution, is in concert, it should seem, with this paper, noticing, among other resemblances, the allusion (*repeated*, as it also is in the paper) to the thief upon the cross.

[2] All the submyssyons, ut supr. sign. A. 3. b.

terbury, confess, and grieve from my heart, that I have most grievously sinned against heaven and the English realm; yea, against the Universal Church of Christ, which I have more cruelly persecuted than Paul did of old, who have been a blasphemer, a persecutor, and contumelious. And I wish that I, who have exceeded Saul in malice and wickedness, might with Paul make amends for the honour which I have detracted from Christ, and the benefit of which I have deprived the Church. But yet that thief in the Gospel comforts my mind. For then at last he repented from his heart, then it irked him of his theft, when he might steal no more. And I who, abusing my office and authority, purloined Christ of his honour, and the realm of faith and religion, now by the great mercy of God returned to myself, acknowledge myself the greatest of all sinners, and to every one as well as I can, to God first, then to the Church and its supreme head, and to the king and queen, and lastly to the realm of England, to render worthy satisfaction. But as that happy thief, when he was not able to pay the money and wealth which he had taken away, when neither his feet nor his hands fastened to the cross could do their office; by heart only and tongue, which were not bound, he testified what the rest of his members would do, if they enjoyed the same liberty that his tongue did. By that he confessed Christ to be innocent; by that

he reproved the impudence of his fellow; by that he detested his former life, and obtained the pardon of his sins, and as it were by a kind of key opened the gates of paradise. By the example of this man I do conceive no small hopes of Christ's mercy; that he will pardon my sins. I want hands and feet, by which I might build up again that which I have destroyed; for the lips of my mouth are only left me. But he will receive the calves of our lips, who is merciful beyond all belief. By this hope conceived, therefore I choose to offer this calf, to sacrifice this very small part of my body and life.

"I confess, in the first place, my unthankfulness against the great God. I acknowledge myself unworthy of all favour and pity, but most worthy not only of human and temporal, but divine and eternal punishment; that I exceedingly offended against king Henry VIII. and especially against queen Catharine his wife, when I was the cause and author of the divorce. Which fault indeed was the seminary of all the evils and calamities of this realm. Hence so many slaughters of good men; hence the schism of the whole kingdom; hence heresies; hence the destruction of so many souls and bodies sprang, that I can scarce comprehend with reason. But when these are so great beginnings of grief, I acknowledge I opened a great window to all heresies, whereof myself acted the chief doctor and leader; but first of all,

which most vehemently torments my mind, that I affected the holy sacrament of the Eucharist with so many blasphemies and reproaches, denying Christ's body and blood to be truly and really contained under the species of bread and wine. By setting forth also books, I did impugn the truth with all my might. In this respect indeed not only worse than Saul and the thief, but the most wicked of all which the earth ever bore. *Lord, I have sinned against heaven, and before Thee.* Against heaven, as I am the cause it hath been deprived of so many saints, denying most impudently that heavenly benefit exhibited to us. And I have sinned against the earth, which so long hath miserably wanted this sacrament. Against men, whom I have called from this supersubstantial morsel; the slayer of so many men as have perished for want of food. I have defrauded the souls of the dead of this daily and most celebrious sacrifice.

"And from all these things it is manifest, how greatly after Christ I have been injurious to his vicar, whom I have deprived of his power by books set forth. Wherefore I do most earnestly and ardently beseech the pope, that he, for the mercy of Christ, forgive me the things I have committed against him and the apostolical see. And I humbly beseech the most serene sovereigns of England, Spain, &c. Philip and Mary, that by their royal mercy they would pardon me. I ask

and beseech the whole realm, yea, the Universal Church, that they take pity of this wretched being, to whom, besides a tongue, nothing is left, whereby to make amends for the injuries and damages I have brought in. But especially, because against Thee only I have sinned, I beseech Thee, most merciful Father, who desirest and commandest all to come to Thee, however wicked, vouchsafe to look upon me nearly, and under Thy hand, as Thou lookedst upon Magdalen and Peter; or certainly as Thou, looking upon the thief on the cross, didst vouchsafe by the promise of Thy grace and glory to comfort a fearful and trembling mind; so, by Thy wonted and natural pity, turn the eyes of Thy mercy to me, and vouchsafe me worthy to have that Word of Thine spoken to me, *I am thy salvation;* and in the day of death, *To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.*

"Per me THOMAM CRANMER."

"*Written this year of our Lord,* 1555-6, *the* 18*th day of March.*"

For what purpose, it may be asked, were this and the preceding instrument formed in a language known only to the learned? Were they to be detailed only so far, in our own, to the common people, as not to lead them to a belief that other words than Cranmer's were recited? But whatever was the intention, and admitting the contents

of both the instruments, though paltering in a double tongue, to be universally known, numbers still disbelieved that Cranmer was entirely lost, that yet he would not redeem himself. When he ascended the platform at St. Mary's on the morning of his martyrdom, numbers wept, says the Roman Catholic who witnessed the scene, having indeed "[1] conceived *an assured hope of his conversion and repentance,*" which, ere a few minutes had elapsed, was disappointed. But again, when the fallen prelate began to pray, this honest spectator divides the listening audience into "those that hated him before, [the Romanists] who now loved him for his [fancied] conversion and hope of continuance,"—and "those that loved him before, [the Protestants] who could not suddenly hate him, *having hope of his confession again of his fall.*" Why, also, was the fifth recantation, published by prelates and divines immediately after it was made, suppressed by an order of the Privy Council? Was it because a suspicion was believed to exist, that Cranmer's assent to it was incapable of proof? No, says the apologist for this questionable proceeding: "[2] *Perhaps* it was incorrectly printed; *perhaps* they waited for *that which he said God would inspire him to make.*" What the Privy

[1] Strype. The whole evidence of this spectator will presently be given.

[2] Lingard, Hist. Eng. 8vo. vii. 276. n.

Council are thus conjectured as expecting from the archbishop, is nothing more than what is flippantly [1] pretended as his expression by the French ambassador; not a shadow of authority for which is any where to be found. That it was *incorrectly* printed, is probable enough. But Pole and Bonner intended not merely to correct it, but to reprint it with the four preceding papers, and with the production of a sixth. Indeed this is the only recantation, to which historians formerly drew the attention of their readers. Hence Collier, after Foxe, relates, that on the day of Cranmer's execution, the Spanish friar, "who was a witness to his recantation, *proposed the reading his* [2] *recanta-*

[1] "Il (Cranmer) envoya prier M. le cardinal Polus de differer pour quelques jours son exécution, *espérant que Dieu l'inspireroit cependant.*" Noailles. Lingard, ut supr.

[1] Foxe calls it "a paper with articles, which Cranmer should openly profess in his recantation before the people, earnestly desiring him that he would write the said instrument with his own hand, and sign it with his name; which when he had done, the said friar desired that he would write another copy thereof, which should remain with him, and that he did also." Hence the interpretation of Burnet: "He was (now) dealt with to renew his subscription, and *to write the whole over again.*" But the most curious, and I believe hitherto unnoticed, mention in regard to this fifth recantation, and what was selected from it for Cranmer to avow before the people at his execution, occurs in the continuation of *The Chronicles of Fabian*, Lond. 1559. vol. 2. p. 564. "In this year (1556) in Lent, Thomas Cranmer, archbishoppe of Canterbury, after that he had recanted his *supposed* recantation, was brent at Oxford."

tion to a public audience, and to this purpose desired him to subscribe the instrument with his own hand and sign it." Of any new submission on the fatal morning this historian seems to have entertained no belief. Burnet is alike silent. Thus too the Romish biographer of Pole, with the printed submissions of the archbishop at his service, speaks apparently of none but that which is numbered the fifth by Bonner, and after noticing the writ for burning him, says, " Cranmer *had again renewed his subscription,* and transcribed a fair copy of the whole; but, having some misgivings of his approaching punishment, he secretly wrote another declaration, which contradicted, in every point, the doctrine he had before signed." What here is called a renewed subscription, is affirmed, however, in the recent history of our country, to be nothing less than the copy of a " [1] *seventh instrument of abjuration.*" Is it improbable, however, that what the friar proposed, was merely the fifth recantation more correctly written than the hastily printed copy had given it? To this the signature of Cranmer was requisite, and it was made, together with that of the friar; but, it is especially to be observed, is undated. It would now be ready for Bonner's publication, as the fifth instrument; while a written abbreviation of the material parts of it would be sufficient for Cranmer

[1] Lingard, Hist. Eng. 8vo vii. 274.

" openly to profess before the people;" and accordingly Bonner, without the statement of its being a new subscription, without the pretence of its being a seventh recantation, prints only *what the martyr was to have spoken*, but basely conceals the fact *that he did not speak it*. The faith that he was to assert was thus worded for him. "[1] First, I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, &c. And I believe every article of the catholic faith, every clause, word, and sentence, taught by our Saviour Christ and his Apostles, and Prophets, in the New and Old Testament, and all articles explicate and set forth in general councils. And now I come to the great thing that so much troubleth my conscience more than any other thing that ever I did, that is, setting abroad untrue books and writings, contrary to the truth of God's Word, which now I renounce and condemn, and refuse them utterly as erroneous and for none of mine. But you must know also what books they were, that you may beware of them, or else my conscience is not discharged. For they be the books which I wrote against the sacrament of the altar, since the death of king Henry the Eighth. But whatsoever I wrote then, now is time and place to say truth. Wherefore renouncing all those books, and whatsoever in them is contained, I say, and

[1] All the submyssyons, ut supr. sign. B. 2. a.

believe, that our Saviour Christ Jesus is really and substantially contained in the blessed sacrament of the altar under the forms of bread and wine."

So ends the tract, affirmed in the title-page "*to have been seen and examined by Bonner.*" Upon him, therefore, rests the responsibility of the compilation, even if by any other hand than his own it had been compiled; upon him the shame also, which if not to other parts of it, at least to the conclusion, belongs, where what the sufferer really spoke is concealed, but what was prepared for him to *have spoken* is related, and by many of the compiler's party was afterwards reported, as if indeed he *did* speak it.

To Cranmer's own words in abhorrence of his weakness, and to the [1] brightening of his character in the flame that consumed him, we will now attend.

[1] Hallam, 8vo. i. 136.

CHAPTER VI.

1556.

Cranmer retracts his recantations, and is burnt.

THE last humiliating paper, which bore the date of the 18th of March, served only to expedite the execution of Cranmer. It had all along been resolved that he should suffer. The fatal morning was now fixed for the 21st of the month. Against that day Dr. Cole, provost of Eton College, had before been [1] *secretly* commanded by the queen to prepare a sermon. Nobility and gentry, residing near Oxford, had been also desired at the same time to attend, not without their servants and retinue, lest the death of the archbishop should excite a tumult. On the 20th, Dr. Cole visited the prisoner; and there can be little doubt that Cranmer found by his discourse, what was not however distinctly named, that his last hour was fixed. Have you continued, said Cole, in the catholic faith, wherein before I left you?—By

[1] Foxe. Burnet. Strype.

God's grace, replied the archbishop, I would be more confirmed in the catholic faith. Other conversation, we may be sure, would afford hints that could not be mistaken. I agree with [1] another of his biographers in believing, that after Cole had left the prison, *Cranmer drew up his prayer, his exhortation, his repentant speech.* On the morning of the 21st, Cole is again described as visiting him, at a very early hour, as it should seem, when he asked him if he had any money; and, being answered that he had none, supplied him with fifteen crowns; an intimation that at his death might be distributed, what then at funerals was not infrequent, the *dole* or distribution of alms to the poor. Dr. Cole then left him. The Spanish friar is represented as next approaching him, and offering "[2] a paper with articles which he should openly profess in his recantation before the people." The paper is thus described, by two eloquent historians of our country; the first of whom can hardly in any respect be contradicted, while the other must allow us a review of his narrative. "The court," says Hume, "equally perfidious and cruel, were determined *that his recantation should avail* him nothing; and they sent him orders that he should be *required to acknowledge his errors in church before the whole people*, and that he should thence be immediately

[1] Gilpin. [2] Foxe.

carried to execution. Cranmer, whether that he had received a secret intimation of their design, or had repented of his weakness, surprised the audience by a contrary declaration." Dr. Lingard relates, that the friar "came, not to announce a pardon, but to comfort and prepare the prisoner for the last trial. Entertaining no suspicion of sincerity, Garcina submitted to his consideration a paper, which he advised him to read at the stake as a public testimony of his repentance. It consisted of five parts; a request that the spectators would pray with him; a form of prayer for himself; an exhortation to others to lead a virtuous life; a declaration of the queen's right to the crown; and a confession of faith, with a retractation of the doctrine in his book on the Eucharist. Cranmer, having dissembled so long, resolved to carry on the deception. He transcribed and signed the paper; and giving one copy to the Spaniard, retained the other for his own use. But when the friar was gone, he appears to have made a second copy, in which entirely omitting the fourth article, the assertion of the queen's title, he substituted in lieu of the confession contained in the fifth, a disavowal of the six retractations, which he had already made. Of his motives we can judge only from his conduct. Probably he now considered himself doubly armed. If a pardon were now announced, he might take the benefit of it, and read the original paper; if not, by reading

the copy, he would disappoint the expectations of his adversaries, and repair the scandal which he had given to his brethren." We must first observe what Cranmer himself said, in order to bestow upon these assertions a fair examination. A Roman Catholic spectator of the martyrdom shall tell us what he heard and saw; whose evidence is the more to be trusted, inasmuch as he conceals not his religious prejudices against the martyr, while he frankly admits the self-possession, and honours the fortitude, that graced his last moments. About the hour of nine the procession received him at the prison-gate, and set forward. From the spectator's letter to his friend we learn the rest. It was as follows.

"[1] But that I know for our great friendship, and long-continued love, you look even of duty, that I should signify to you of the truth of such things as here chanceth among us, I would not at this time have written to you the unfortunate end and doubtful tragedy of Thomas Cranmer, late bishop of Canterbury, because I little pleasure take in beholding of such heavy sights. And when they are once overpassed, I like not to rehearse them again; being but a renewing of my woe, and doubling my grief. For although his former life, and wretched end, deserves a greater misery,

[1] First printed entire by Strype from Foxe's manuscripts.

(if any greater might have chanced than chanced unto him,) yet setting aside his offences to God and his country, and beholding the man without his faults, I think there was none that pitied not his case, and bewailed his fortune, and feared not his own chance, to see so noble a prelate, so grave a councillor, of so long-continued honour, after so many dignities, in his old years to be deprived of his estate, adjudged to die, and in so painful a death to end his life. I have no delight to increase it. Alas, it is too much of itself, that ever so heavy a case should betide to man, and man to deserve it.

"But to come to the matter: On Saturday last, being the 21st of March, was his day appointed to die. And because the morning was much rainy, the sermon, appointed by Mr. Dr. Cole to be made at the stake, was made in St. Mary's Church. Whither Dr. Cranmer was brought by the Mayor and Aldermen, and my Lord Williams. With whom came divers gentlemen of the shire, Sir T. A. Bridges, Sir John Browne, and others. Where was prepared, over against the pulpit, a high place for him, that all the people might see him. And when he had ascended it, he kneeled down and prayed, weeping tenderly; which moved a great number to tears, *that had conceived an assured hope of his conversion and repentance.*

"Then Mr. Cole began his sermon. The sum

whereof was this. First, he declared causes why it was expedient that he should suffer, notwithstanding his reconciliation. The chief are these: One was, for that he had been a great cause of all this alteration in this realm of England. And when the matter of the divorce, between king Henry VIII. and queen Catharine, was commenced in the court of Rome, he, having nothing to do with it, sate upon it as judge, which was the entry to all the inconveniences that followed. Yet in that he excused him, that he thought he did it not of malice, but by the persuasions and advice of certain learned men. Another was, that he had been the great setter forth of all this heresy received into the church in this last time; had written in it, had disputed, had continued it, even to the last hour; and that it had never been seen in this realm, (but in the time of schism,) that any man continuing so long hath been pardoned: and that it was not to be remitted for ensample's sake. Other causes he alleged; but these were the chief, why it was not thought good to pardon him. Other causes beside, he said, moved the queen and the council thereto, which were not meet and convenient for every one to understand them.

"The second part touched the audience, how they should consider this thing; that they should hereby take example to fear God; and that there was no power against the Lord; having before

their eyes a man of so high degree, sometime one of the chiefest prelates of the church, an archbishop, the chief of the Council, the second peer of the realm of long time: a man, as might be thought, in greatest assurance, a king of his side; notwithstanding all his authority and defence to be debased from a high estate to a low degree; of a councillor to be a caitiff; and to be set in so wretched estate, that the poorest wretch would not change conditions with him.

"The last and end appertained unto him. Whom he comforted and encouraged to take his death well, by many places of Scripture. And with these, and such, bidding him nothing mistrust but he should incontinently receive that the thief did: to whom Christ said, *Hodiè mecum eris in paradiso.* And out of St. Paul armed him against the terrors of the fire, by this, *Dominus fidelis est: Non sinet nos tentari ultra quam ferre potestis;* by the example of the three children, to whom God made the flame seem like a pleasant dew. He added hereunto the rejoicing of St. Andrew in his cross; the patience of St. Laurence on the fire; ascertaining him, that God, if he called on Him, and to such as die in His faith, either will abate the fury of the flame, or give him strength to abide it. He glorified God much in his conversion; because it appeared to be only His work: declaring what travel and conference had been used with him to convert him, and all pre-

vailed not, till it pleased God of his mercy to reclaim him, and call him home. In discoursing of which place, he much commended Cranmer, and qualified his former doing.

" And I had almost forgotten to tell you, that Mr. Cole promised him, that he should be prayed for in every church in Oxford, and should have *Mass* and *Dirige* sung for him; and spake to all the priests present to say mass for his soul.

" When he had ended his sermon, he desired all the people to pray for him: Mr. Cranmer kneeling down with them, and praying for himself. I think there never was such a number so earnestly praying together. For they that hated him before, now loved him for his conversion, and hope of continuance. They that loved him before could not suddenly hate him, *having hope of his confession again of his fall.* So love and hope encreased devotion on every side.

" I shall not need, for the time of sermon, to describe his behaviour, his sorrowful countenance, his heavy cheer, his face bedewed with tears; sometime lifting his eyes to heaven in hope, sometime casting them down to the earth for shame; to be brief, an image of sorrow; the dolour of his heart bursting out at his eyes in plenty of tears; retaining ever a quiet and grave behaviour. Which increased the pity in men's hearts, that they unfeignedly loved him, hoping it had been his repentance for his transgression and error. I

shall not need, I say, to point it out unto you; you can much better imagine it yourself.

"When praying was done, he stood up, and having leave to speak, said, 'Good people, I had intended indeed to desire you to pray for me; which because Mr. Doctor hath desired, and you have done already, I thank you most heartily for it. And now will I pray for myself, *as I could best devise for mine own comfort, and say the prayer, word for word, as I have here written it.*' And he read it standing: and after kneeled down, and said the Lord's Prayer; and all the people on their knees devoutly praying with him. His prayer was thus:

"O Father of heaven; O Son of God, Redeemer of the world; O Holy Ghost, proceeding from them both, three persons and one God, have mercy upon me most wretched caitiff, and miserable sinner. I who have offended both heaven and earth, and more grievously than any tongue can express, whither then may I go, or whither should I fly for succour? To heaven I may be ashamed to lift up mine eyes; and in earth I find no refuge. What shall I then do? Shall I despair? God forbid. O good God, Thou art merciful, and refusest none that come unto Thee for succour. To Thee therefore do I run. To Thee do I humble myself: saying, O Lord God, my sins be great, but yet have mercy upon me for Thy great mercy. O God the Son, thou wast not made man, this great mystery was not wrought,

for few or small offences. Nor thou didst not give thy Son unto death, O God the Father, for our little and small sins only, but for all the greatest sins of the world; so that the sinner return unto thee with a penitent heart; as I do here at this present. Wherefore have mercy upon me, O Lord, whose property is always to have mercy. For although my sins be great, yet Thy mercy is greater. I crave nothing, O Lord, for mine own merits, but for Thy Name's sake, that it may be glorified thereby: and for thy dear Son Jesus Christ's sake. And now therefore, Our Father, which art in heaven, &c.'—

" Then rising, he said, 'Every man desireth, good people, at the time of their deaths, to give some good exhortation, that others may remember after their deaths, and be the better thereby. So I beseech God grant me grace, that I may speak something at this my departing, whereby God may be glorified, and you edified.

"'First, it is a heavy case to see, that many folks be so much doted upon the love of this false world, and so careful for it, that of the love of God, or the love of the world to come, they seem to care very little or nothing therefore. This shall be my first exhortation: That you set not overmuch by this false glosing world, but upon God and the world to come. And learn to know what this lesson meaneth, which St. John teacheth, *that the love of this world is hatred against God.*

"'The second exhortation is, that next unto God, you obey your king and queen, willingly and gladly, without murmur or grudging. And not for fear of them only, but much more for the fear of God: Knowing, that they be God's ministers, appointed by God to rule and govern you. And therefore whoso resisteth them, resisteth God's ordinance.

"'The third exhortation is, that you love all together like brethren and sisters. For alas, pity it is to see, what contention and hatred one Christian man hath to another; not taking each other, as sisters and brothers; but rather as strangers and mortal enemies. But I pray you learn and bear well away this one lesson, To do good to all men as much as in you lieth, and to hurt no man, no more than you would hurt your own natural and loving brother or sister. For this you may be sure of, that whosoever hateth any person, and goeth about maliciously to hinder or hurt him, surely, and without all doubt, God is not with that man, although he think himself never so much in God's favour.

"'The fourth exhortation shall be to them that have great substance and riches of this world, that they will well consider and weigh those sayings of the Scripture. One is of our Saviour Christ himself, who saith, *It is hard for a rich man to enter into heaven;* a sore saying, and yet spoke by him, that knew the truth. The second is of

St. John, whose saying is this, *He that hath the substance of this world, and seeth his brother in necessity, and shutteth up his mercy from him, how can he say, he loveth God?* Much more might I speak of every part; but time sufficeth not. I do but put you in remembrance of things. Let all them that be rich, ponder well those sentences; for if ever they had any occasion to shew their charity, they have now at this present, the poor people being so many, and [1] victuals so dear. For though I have been long in prison, yet I have heard of the great penury of the poor. Consider, that that which is given to the poor, is given to God; whom we have not otherwise present corporally with us, but in the poor.

"'And now forsomuch as I am come to the last end of my life, whereupon hangeth all my life passed, and my life to come, either to live with my Saviour Christ in heaven, in joy, or else to be in pain ever with wicked devils in hell; and I see before mine eyes presently either heaven ready to receive me, or hell ready to swallow me up; I shall therefore declare unto you my very faith,

[1] The scarcity at Oxford now "was so great, that several societies, being scarce able to live, had leave from their governors to go into the country to their respective homes, to remain there till such time as bread-corn was more plentiful." Wood, Ann. Univ. Ox. under the year 1555, at the close of it, which according to the computation of that time would be, then, within four days of Cranmer's death.

how I believe, without colour or dissimulation. For now is no time to dissemble, whatsoever I have written in times past.

"'First, I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, &c. and every article of the Catholic faith, every word and sentence taught by our Saviour Christ, his Apostles and Prophets, in the Old and New Testament.

"'And now I come to the great thing that troubleth my conscience more than any other thing that ever I said or did in my life: and that is, the setting abroad *of writings contrary to the truth. Which here now I renounce, and refuse, as things written with my hand contrary to the truth which I thought in my heart, and writ for fear of death, and to save my life, if it might be: and that is, all such bills, which I have written or signed with mine own hand, since my degradation; wherein I have written many things untrue. And forasmuch as my hand offended in writing contrary to my heart, therefore my hand shall first be punished. For if I may come to the fire, it shall be first burned. And as for the pope, I refuse him, as Christ's enemy and antichrist, with all his false doctrine.*'

"And here being admonished of his recantation, and dissembling, he said, Alas, my lord, I have been a man, that all my life loved plainness, and never dissembled till now against the truth; which I am most sorry for. He added hereunto, that for the sacrament, he believed as he had taught

in his book against the bishop of Winchester. And here he was suffered to speak no more.

"So that his speech contained chiefly three points; love to God, love to the king, and love to the neighbour. In the which talk he held men very suspense, which all depended upon the conclusion; where he so far deceived all men's expectations, that at the hearing thereat, they were much amazed; and let him go on awhile, till my lord Williams bade him play the Christian man, and remember himself. To whom he answered, that he so did; for now he spake truth.

"Then he was carried away; and a great number, that did run to see him go so wickedly to his death, ran after him, exhorting him, while time was, to remember himself. And one friar John, a godly and well-learned man, all the way travelled with him to reduce him. But it would not be. What they said in particular I cannot tell, but the effect appeared in the end. For at the stake he professed, that he died in all such opinions as he had taught, and *oft repented him of his recantation.*

"Coming to the stake with a cheerful countenance, and willing mind, he put off his garments with haste, and stood upright in his shirt: and a bachelor of divinity named Elye, of Brasen-Nose College, laboured to convert him to his *former recantation,* with the two Spanish friars. But when the friars saw his constancy, they said in Latin

one to another, *Let us go from him; we ought not to be nigh him; for the devil is with him.* But the bachelor in divinity was more earnest with him. Unto whom he answered, '*That as concerning his recantation, he repented it right sore, because he knew it was against the truth;*' with other words more. Whereupon the lord Williams cried, Make short, make short. Then the bishop took certain of his friends by the hand. But the bachelor of divinity refused to take him by the hand, and blamed all others that so did, and said, he was sorry that ever he came in his company. And yet again he required him to agree to his *former recantation.* And the bishop answered, (shewing his hand,) '*This is the hand that wrote it, and therefore shall it suffer first punishment.*'—

" Fire being now put to him, he stretched out his right hand, and thrust it into the flame, and held it there a good space, before the fire came to any other part of his body; where his hand was seen of every man sensibly burning, crying with a loud voice, '*This hand hath offended.*' As soon as the fire got up, he was very soon dead, never stirring or crying all the while.

" His patience in the torment, his courage in dying, if it had been taken either for the glory of God, the wealth of his country, or the testimony of truth, as it was for a pernicious error and subversion of true religion, I could worthily have commended the example, and matched it with

the fame of any Father of ancient time: but seeing that not the death, but the cause and quarrel thereof, commendeth the sufferer, I cannot but much dispraise his obstinate stubbornness and sturdiness in dying, and specially in so evil a cause. Surely his death much grieved every man; but not after one sort. Some pitied to see his body so tormented with the fire raging upon the silly carcass, that counted not of the folly. Others that passed not much of the body, lamented to see him spill his soul, wretchedly, without redemption, to be plagued for ever. His friends sorrowed for love: his enemies for pity: strangers for a common kind of humanity, whereby we are bound one to another. Thus I have enforced myself, for your sake, to discourse this heavy narration, contrary to my mind: and being more than half weary, I make a short end, wishing you a quieter life, with less honour; and easier death, with more praise. The 23d of March, [1555-6.]

"Yours, J. A."

After this testimony of the spectator, that the archbishop said "he would pray for himself, *as he could best devise for his own comfort*, and say the prayer, word for word, as he had written it," we cannot suppose, with the historian, that the "friar's paper" supplied it. That the prayer was his own composition, which at this moment he took from his bosom, we may believe from

its identity also with what as a Protestant he had been accustomed so earnestly to assert of Christ's oblation. Whither, he says in this impressive orison, wretched caitiff as I am, shall I fly for succour? He returns answer to himself, that God gave not his Son unto death for small sins only, but for all the greatest sins of the world, so that the sinner returns to Him in heart. So in his admirable book on the sacrament he wrote, "[1] Come to our Redeemer and Saviour Christ, who refresheth all that truly come unto him, be their anguish and heaviness never so great:" So in his answer to Gardiner, who opposed his doctrine of the sufficiency of Christ's sacrifice, "[2] What ought to be more certain and known to all Christian people, than that Christ died once, and but once, for the redemption of the world? And what can be more true, than that his only death is our life? And what can be more comfortable to a penitent sinner that is sorry for his sin, and returneth to God in his heart and whole mind, than to know that Christ dischargeth him of the heavy load of his sin?"

Then as to the exhortation, again we disbelieve the friar to have submitted to him the words. Again we trace in them the archbishop's former sentiments and language. It is a heavy case, he says, to see how many folks be so much doted of

[1] Pref. to the work. [2] Conclusion of the answer.

this present world, and so careful of it, that for the world to come they seem to care very little or nothing. The very repetition of what three years before he had written to Cecil, "[1] I am not so doted to set my mind upon things here, which neither I can carry away with me, nor tarry long with them." It is remarkable that in Bonner's tract the conclusion of the archbishop's exhortation, where he alludes to his long imprisonment, is suppressed.

But Garcina is said to have proffered, and the archbishop to have copied, what is called *a declaration of the queen's right to the crown.* In regard to such a declaration the attentive and impartial spectator offers not a syllable. Dr. Lingard says, that the archbishop entirely omitted it "in a second copy of the articles which he *appears* to have made, after the friar had left him." Has the historian, then, seen the friar's own or any other copy of the articles, which at once verifies the charge of omission in Cranmer's? Not so. For even Bonner's tract here pretends no distinct article, but gives only this direction, "*Here to declare the queen's just title to the crown,*" which is the preliminary to the renunciation, or the words that were prepared for him to speak, which, as it was "[2] notoriously known to hundreds of persons present" at the martyrdom, he did not speak, and which Bonner dared not print as either signed by

[1] See before, p. 284.

[2] Strype.

Cranmer himself, or as attested by the Spanish friar, or by any other person. It was the fifth recantation, I cannot then but conclude, that had been hastily printed and immediately ordered to be burnt, which Garcina on the fatal morning brought newly written, requiring and obtaining from Cranmer, who could not deny what it contained, his signature to it; and suggesting an abbreviated admission of it before the people. The public would be anxious to possess what had been suspiciously withdrawn from them. The Privy Council, who had been "[1] *concerned*" at the first appearance of this recantation, could not but be desirous to supply the information. Nor would the friar, we may suppose, conceal from Cranmer that his four preceding recantations, with this and the sixth, were intended for publication. This indeed, the only complete one, was then the general theme, while the sixth had been sent to the court only three days before, and by few even there perhaps as yet had been seen. It is to this fifth paper, that the man of Brasen-Nose College must have referred, when, insulting Cranmer on his way to the stake, he, " with [2] the two

[1] On the 13th of March, " when they heard that Cranmer's paper of recantation was published." Burnet. On the 16th the printers entered into a recognizance that the recantations should be burnt. Lansdowne MSS. No. 980. p. 189.

[2] Foxe calls them friar Richard, and friar John. The latter was Garcina; the former is not known. There were several Spanish ecclesiastics who had accompanied Philip to England.

Spanish friars, laboured to convert him to his *former recantation.*" It could be this paper only that one of the friars, (Garcina we may suppose,) "raging and foaming, almost out of his wits," forced upon the notice of the victim, with the words, "*Nonne fecisti? Didst thou it not?*"

Foxe, in his further account of the dying hour, adds to the Roman Catholic's narrative a personal description of the sufferer that may not here be overpassed. "His head," says the martyrologist, "when both his caps were off, was so bare that one hair could not be seen upon it: his [1] beard was long and thick: such a countenance of gravity moved the hearts both of his friends and of his enemies." After noticing yet one more vain attempt of the Spanish friars to shake the archbishop's resolution, and the uncharitable refusal of the academic to accept his hand, Foxe exhibits him bound with an iron chain to the stake, and the flames kindled; next, as the fire began to burn near him, not only thrusting his right hand into the flame, but holding it so that all men might see it consumed before his body was touched; and then, when enveloped in flames, enduring the torment with such heroism as apparently to move no more than the stake to which he was bound, while his eyes were lifted up to heaven, and his

[1] It had been suffered, probably, thus to grow, while he was in prison.

tongue was repeatedly exclaiming, so long as it would suffer him, *That unworthy hand,* and *Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.*

"His sufferings were [1] *short,*" Dr. Lingard says; as if holding the hand in the flame "*a good space* before the fire came to any other part of his body," nor flinching while it was reduced to ashes, were a brief torment; as if such fortitude, which even from Voltaire has elicited the commendation of being more intrepid than the similar act of Mutius Scævola, deserved no encomium in a history of our country. But the learned historian, if he has not lauded, at least has not dispraised, the deed. Alan Cope, however, not only [2] contemptuously and almost immediately forbade the comparison of it with that of Scævola, but also pointed to another example, as still more valuable than the patriot's, in the history of a martyr of the Church of Rome, whose hand the fire could not injure!

For the flames that consumed the archbishop these were the charges:

[3] For a hundred of wood fagots, ...	0	6	0
For a hundred and a half of furze fagots,	0	3	4
For the carriage of them, ...	0	0	8
To two labourers, ...	0	1	4

[1] Hist. Eng. 8vo. vii.

[2] Dialogi Sex, etc. contra Pseudomartyres, &c. Antverpiæ, 1573, p. 547.

[3] Strype.

We have now seen "the end of this learned archbishop," (to use the judicious words of Foxe,) "whom, lest by evil subscribing he should have perished, by well recanting God preserved; and, lest he should have lived longer with shame and reproof, it pleased God rather to take him away, to the glory of His Name and the profit of His Church."

He suffered in the sixty-seventh year of his age, and had presided over the Church of England above twenty years.

CHAPTER VII.

The archbishop's family at the time of his martyrdom—Seizure of part of his possessions by queen Mary—The restoration in blood of his children, by Act of parliament, in the reign of Elizabeth—Petition of his son Thomas to that sovereign.

DURING his imprisonment, and at his closing scene, we find not, in the biographies of the archbishop, any mention of wife, or child, or other relative, attending or contributing to console and support him. Fear perhaps, if not the injunction of authority, restrained their interference. Or probably the committal of their great kinsman to the Tower had been to them the warning, not unheeded, for voluntary exile or careful concealment. His younger brother, Edmund, the archdeacon of Canterbury, had been deprived indeed of all his preferments by the [1] Marian order against the married clergy. But his elder brother,

[1] See before, p. 417.

John, was still possessed of the patrimonial manors at Aslacton and Whatton; to whose son, Thomas, the archbishop had [1] assigned the rectories also of those places, which, in the first year of Edward, he had purchased of that sovereign, and which had belonged to the dissolved monastery of Welbeck. To this nephew they had been probably assigned under a condition that the archbishop's wife, if she survived him, should enjoy the revenues, and that after her death the rectories and manors should be the united property of the head of the Cranmer family. Possessed of both this nephew died, and to his heir they descended; but, before the sixteenth century closed, the property changed hands, being purchased by an ancestor of the duke of Portland, in whose family it remained till about half a century since, when the demesnes were sold in three allotments to others.

That this rectorial property, and [2] not an abbey in Nottinghamshire, was the subsistence for the archbishop's widow, I have little doubt, as I can find no mention of the grant of any religious house either to her or to Cranmer, distinct from annexa-

[1] Strype.

[2] Strype and others have imagined an abbey in Nottinghamshire to have been settled upon her by Henry; and some have pronounced it to have been *Welbeck*; misled by the circumstance perhaps of the rectories having belonged to that *religious house*.

tion to the see of Canterbury, except the monastery of Kirkstall in the county of York, to which the nunnery of Arthington also belonged. These had been granted and confirmed to the archbishop both by [1] Henry and Edward; and, in the book of royal sales by the latter, a reference to other property in Yorkshire, *Nottinghamshire*, and Kent, conveyed with them, is also made; among which we may conclude the rectories of Aslacton and Whatton to have been named. The settlement of these minor possessions was now undisturbed. The immediate heir of Cranmer was not concerned in them. But the rich demesnes of Kirkstall Mary seized as her right upon the archbishop's attainture as a traitor, although she had pardoned the treason! His son appears to have long suffered by the loss, as his petition to Elizabeth will presently shew. Meantime let us revert to the archbishop's widow. Strype says, that she was living toward the latter end of archbishop Parker's time; Ames, upon what authority I know not, says that she married Edward Whitchurch, the celebrated printer, in the reign of Edward, who had been a merchant, who had been well known to the arch-

[1] Strype mentions them as granted only by Edward, and further mistakes the bestowal *as if for especial services.* The grant of it was by Henry in the 34th year of his reign, confirmed in the 1st and 4th of Edward's, in exchange for archiepiscopal possessions. See also Tanner under *Kirkstall* and *Arthington.*

bishop, and who smarted also under the severities of Mary.

Four sisters of Cranmer, [1] married to persons of distinction, I may add, lived to hear of his martyrdom.

His son Thomas, and his daughter Margaret, his only surviving children, were restored in blood by an [2] Act of Parliament, Feb. 27, 1562-3. Some years afterwards this son awakened Elizabeth's remembrance of his father, and detailed to her his own losses, in the following petition.

" [3] To the Queen's most excellent Majesty.

" In most humble and loyal wise sheweth unto your Majesty your poor and hapless subject, Thomas Cranmer, son unto Thomas Cranmer, late archbishop of Canterbury, That whereas your said subject's father having purchased of your Highness's father and brother of famous memory the Monastery of Kirkstall, and the Nunnery of Arthington, and divers woods to them belonging, to him and his heirs in fee simple; and, intending to leave the same to your poor subject and supplicant, made two several feoffments thereof, the one of the Manor of Kirkstall and the demesnes, the other of the Nunnery of Arthington and the woods, both of them to the use of himself for

[1] See the genealogical table prefixed to this Life.

[2] Strype, and Sir Simons D'Ewes, Journ. of the House of Lords.

[3] Original MS. Lansdowne MSS. No. 107. art. 72.

life and after his decease to his executors for the term of twenty years, the remainder to Thomas Cranmer his son, your Highness's said supplicant, and his heirs of his body lawfully begotten, the remainder in fee to the said archbishop and his heirs for ever: So it is, most dread sovereign, *that the said archbishop being attainted of high treason in the first year of queen Mary, she entered upon the aforesaid Monastery of Kirkstall and the Nunnery of Arthington and the woods,* and demised or let them in lease to one Gawin and others for the term of 21 years, reserving the yearly rent of 57*l.* which your Majesty received until the 14th year of your Highness's reign, being of the yearly value of 200*l.* whereby your Majesty's poor suppliant was indemnified to the value of 4000*l.* to the great impoverishing of your Majesty's subject, although by the laws of the realm the said lands were your Highness's poor subject's, immediately after the decease of the said archbishop his father, as it is upon the most chargeable suit of your subject adjudged by your Highness's Court of Common Pleas.

" And likewise, may it please your most excellent Majesty, your poor suppliant and subject aforesaid, by reason of the concealment of the said deed of Arthington and the woods, was constrained to buy the said Arthington Nunnery of your Highness, and paid to your Highness for the same 108*l.* besides much money spent in the com-

passing thereof, and bought two great woods called Hawkesworth and Westwood of the earl of Warwick, to whom your Highness had given them as concealed lands, which cost your poor suppliant and subject ——, and yet did not enjoy them, for that the woods were not sufficiently conveyed to the earl of Warwick, whereupon the estate of your poor suppliant depended; so that coming to your Majesty's hands again, by defect of the said patent, you exchanged them with Sir Henry Darcy, whereby your Highness's poor subject did not only lose the said woods, but also forfeited a bond of 2000*l.* and 400*l.* to Sir Thomas Danby, to whom your Highness's poor suppliant was forced to sell them with general warranty, whereby your poor suppliant's lands were extended by force of the said bond of 2000*l.* and 400*l.* and presently after the said extent were bought of Sir Thomas Danby, by one who bought your Majesty's patent of exchange of the said Sir Henry Darcy, whereby your Majesty's poor subject was constrained to sell all his lands to the said party far under the value they were worth. All which said troubles, and miseries, happened unto your Majesty's said subject, for that the said subject's evidence was either of malice, or of sinister policy, detained and concealed, which now too late (without your Majesty's mercy) are come to his hands.

"May it therefore please your Highness, the

premises weighed, and in consideration of your subject's poor estate, *and in regard of the true and loyal service of his said father done unto your Majesty's father and brother of famous memory,* to give unto your said poor subject forty pounds per annum in fee-farm, or a lease in reversion of fourscore years, paying your Majesty the accustomed rent of fourscore pounds yearly, or otherwise what best shall please your Majesty. And your subject during life shall prostrate himself to your most gracious pleasure."

With what success this application was attended, I am unable to state.

CHAPTER VIII.

Recapitulation of Cranmer's writings—Review of his character.

THE writings of the archbishop which have been printed, entire or in part, I will now recapitulate in chronological order.

A [1] long speech in the house of lords, in 1534, discussing the propriety of a general council, and denouncing the authority of the pontiff. Burnet describes it as existing among the manuscripts that were bishop Stillingfleet's. In the two volumes of those manuscripts, which now are in the library at Lambeth palace, it is not to be found. In one of them, however, is a [2] paper in which the intent of general councils, and the power of princes in their own realms to assemble them, are briefly declared; and which is signed by Cranmer, by Tunstal bishop of Durham, by

[1] Burnet, Hist. Ref. Copied in the present work, vol. i. p. 120, seq.

[2] No. 1107. fol. 163. Copied by Burnet, and described by him as a resolution of the subscribing prelates to call a general council.

[1] Clerk bishop of Bath and Wells, and by Goodrich bishop of Ely.

A [2] speech in convocation, in 1536, defending the opinion of Alexander Aless concerning the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

[3] Answers to questions concerning Confirmation, 1537.

[4] Considerations submitted to king Henry in order to a further reformation, 1537.

[5] Injunctions given at his visitation of the see of Hereford, 1538.

[6] Preface to the Translation of the Bible, in 1539, first printed in 1540.

[7] Articles intended to be the doctrine of the Church of England, 1540.

[1] Clerk had been Henry's ambassador to Rome, carrying with him the monarch's book against Luther; afterwards to the ducal brother of Anne of Cleves, with the apology from his fickle sovereign for the divorce. On his way home from this last employment he died. Leland records him as a man of great learning. Of Cranmer's copy of *the king's Anti-Lutheran book* with a few manuscript notes, now the property of a private gentleman, an account was given, not long since, in the Christian Remembrancer.

[2] Foxe, in the Life of Latimer. Copied in the present work, vol. i. p. 162, seq.

[3] Burnet. Copied in the present work, vol. i. p. 188.

[4] Noticed, ibid. 189.

[5] Burnet. See the first vol. of the present work, p. 226.

[6] See the first vol. of the present work, p. 238, seq. and the Appendix to that volume.

[7] Ibid. 298, 336. These articles are copied in part by

[1] Answers to seventeen questions concerning the sacraments, previously to the publication of the Necessary Doctrine, in 1543.

[2] Three brief discourses on his review of the Necessary Doctrine, entitled faith, justification, and forgiveness of injuries.

[3] Other annotations on this review.

[4] Parts of three other discourses against the fear of death, and on patience in sickness and adversity.

[5] Collection of passages from the canon law to shew the necessity of reforming it, about the year 1544.

[6] Speech to Edward the Sixth at his coronation, 1546-7.

Strype from the British Museum manuscript, Cleop. E. 5. In the State-Paper Office there is also a copy of these articles.

[1] Burnet. Collier. Strype. In the British Museum, and in the Lambeth library, are manuscript copies of these answers. Transcribed, so far as they concern Cranmer, in the present work, vol. i. p. 299, seq.

[2] Strype, Life of Cranmer. Append. No. 31. MSS. C. C. Camb.

[3] First printed in the Fathers of the English Church, vol. iii. 1809, p. 77. seq.

[4] Ibid. No. 32.

[5] Burnet. See the first vol. of the present work, p. 358. From the Lambeth MS. No. 1107. fol. 76, seq. Burnet's copy seems to have been made.

[6] Strype. Copied in the present work, vol. ii. p. 3, seq.

[1] Speech in convocation to the clergy, 1547.

[2] The Homilies on salvation, faith, and good works, 1547.

[3] Answers to questions concerning the mass, 1547.

[4] Additions to the translation of Justus Jonas's Catechism, 1548. Henry Wharton rightly observes, "that Cranmer added a large discourse of his own to the exposition of the second commandment, and inserted some few sentences elsewhere."

[5] Against Unwritten Verities, 1548. Strype mentions also another volume of Cranmer's collections, relating to this subject, which he had seen. (Ecc. Mem. iii. 137.) In his Life of Cranmer, he appears to consider what Ames has pronounced a republication of the Unwritten Verities of 1548 to be no more than a miscellaneous compilation, of which probably little was furnished from Cranmer's publication. (See the present vol. p. 176.)

[1] See the present vol. p. 19, p. 25. and the Lambeth MS. No. 1108. fol. 2. where the petition of the clergy is thus stated, "Whether the clergie of the convocation may liberally speake their myndes without dawnger of statute or law."

[2] See the present vol. p. 10, seq.

[3] Burnet. Copied in the present vol. p. 19, seq.

[4] See the present vol. p. 48, seq.

[5] Strype, Ecc. Mem. iii. Append. A. A. See also the present vol. p. 175.

[1] Articles to be inquired into at his visitation, 1548.

[2] Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, entitled, *Concerning the Service of the Church*, 1548-9.

[3] Answers to the fifteen articles of the Devonshire rebels, 1549.

[4] Notes for a homily on the subject of rebellion, 1549.

[5] Defence of the true and catholic doctrine of the sacrament of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ, (his principal work,) 1550.

[6] Vindication of the Defence in answer to bishop Gardiner and Dr. Smith, 1551.

[7] Pious Prayers, supposed by Strype to be translations made by the archbishop in 1552 from the *Orarium, seu libellus precationum*, put forth by the king and clergy, he says, in 1545. The *Orarium*, however, is only the Latin form of English prayers with the litany, bearing the name of the Primer, published in 1544; devotions in the vernacular tongue being then directed to be

[1] Bishop Sparrow's collection 1661, p. 25, seq. Wilkins, Concil. Strype. See the present vol. p. 35, seq.

[2] Strype, from the account given by Bale of Cranmer's writings.

[3] Strype. Copied in the present vol. p. 76, seq.

[4] Strype, Append. Life of Cranmer, No. 41.

[5] See the present vol. p. 347, seq.

[6] Ibid. p. 254.

[7] Ibid. p. 274, seq.

generally used, of which some were probably the compositions of Cranmer; and, in successive editions of this manual, the last of which was in 1553, there are certainly traces of his hand.

[1] Declaration against the mass, 1553. The copies that then were printed were probably called in, as many as might be, and destroyed. One, however, was sent by Grindal to the English exiles, who reprinted it 1557. Valeran Pullan, (or Poullain,) the preacher to the French Protestants, who late in 1553 left the kingdom, appears to have taken another of the first copies away with him, and to have translated it into Latin in 1554. Peter Martyr also probably departed not from England without a copy; for he is [2] said by Julius, his friend, to have told the archbishop, that he should have advised such a declaration, if it had not been already done. But Julius seems not to have been aware of the imperfect state of the declaration.

[3] Disputation at Oxford, 1554.

[4] Speech before the papal commissioners, 1555.

[5] Appeal to a general council, 1555-6.

[6] Speech at his martyrdom, 1555-6.

[1] Strype. Copied in the present vol. p. 368, seq.

[2] Epist. Helvet. Ref. 76.

[3] Foxe. Strype. See the present vol. p. 394, seq. See a curious attested copy of it also, Harl. MSS. 3642.

[4] Foxe. Copied in the present vol. p. 427, seq.

[5] Ibid. 465. Ibid. 498, seq.

His share in the production of the Articles, the Institution, and the Necessary Doctrine, in the reign of Henry; of our Homilies, (besides three of them wholly his own,) our Liturgy and Articles in that of Edward; and of the Reformation of Ecclesiastical Laws in both; has, in the account of these respective formularies, been noticed. A great part of his own and other original papers, as well as his collection of printed books, were either embezzled during his imprisonment, or fell into the hands of his enemies, and were dispersed. Of the former archbishop Parker recovered [1] several. To men of letters his library had been always open; and appears to have possessed treasures, which entirely to have replaced would have exercised, perhaps for many years, the keenest diligence of persons best acquainted with literary history. "I meet with authors here," said his friend, the learned Ascham, to the archbishop, "which the two Universities cannot furnish." Some of the tracts at the opening of the Reformation, among the printed books in the Lambeth library, were probably his: a few larger

[1] Those in the library of Corpus Christi Coll. Camb. and some that are in the British Museum among Foxe's MSS. both often referred to by Burnet and Strype. His manuscripts undoubtedly were numerous. Morice, who was his secretary during twenty years, says, "he was most painfully occupied *in writing of no small volumes* for him from time to time," historical as well as theological.

volumes that bear his autograph, obtained from other hands, are certainly there. Of those, which the British Museum possesses, two at least are very observable, as they relate to the writings of Erasmus; the one containing [1] seven tracts upon the dispute between the illustrious man of Rotterdam and Lee, afterwards archbishop of York, who had attacked the first edition of his annotations upon the New Testament; the other, the *Hyperaspistes*, or Erasmus's reply to the *Servum Arbitrium* of Luther, of which [2] several striking passages are underscored by Cranmer with red ink.

Of his papers, which have been saved, [3] some

[1] Jortin, Erasm. ii. 495.

[2] Dean Tucker, Lett. to Dr. Kippis, 97.

[3] These are known by the name of the Stillingfleet manuscripts. Their contents, which relate to the history of our Reformation, I will briefly mention.

No. 1107. Extracts of passages relating to the laws of the bishop of Rome, fol. 76. De Sacramentis. fol. 84, fol. 95. Confutatio articulorum quorundam quos pretendunt anabaptistæ. fol. 97. De sanctorum veneratione. fol. 116. De imaginibus, and of the right use of images, fol. 121. b. fol. 133. De justificatione, (*D. Redman,*) fol. 137. De bonis operibus et perseverantia. fol. 147. For the general council. fol. 163. Ceremonies to be used in the Church. fol. 167. (Another copy in the Cotton MSS. Cleop. E. 5. printed in Strype's Ecc. Mem. i. Rec. No. 109.)

No. 1108. Petitions of the clergy to the archbishop. fol. 2. Answers to the questions concerning the sacraments. fol. 6, seq. Again, fol. 75, seq. De auctoritate excommunicandi. fol. 46. De auctoritate episcopali in corrigendis vitiis, &c. fol. 49.

are in the library at Lambeth palace, more in that of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; some in that of the State-Paper Office of the realm, with several of his letters; more, of the latter description especially, in the British Museum; a large collection of his letters also in the [1] Chapter House at Westminster; [2] some at Geneva and at Zurich; [3] some that were in possession of the late Dr. Gloucester Ridley; [4] and some in the library

Merita sanctorum. fol. 52. Oratio efficacior propter meritum orantis. fol. 57. De fide. fol 58. De divortio. fol. 144. ad fin. viz. fol. 181. Burnet mentions *a large volume* of Cranmer's collections on this subject among the Stillingfleet manuscripts, which he had seen. Whether he means these *less than forty leaves* as such, I know not. (See the present vol. p. 28.) Some of these leaves are in Cranmer's hand-writing. The questions, and arguments, on the subject, are in various hand-writings. Numerous passages are collected from the Fathers.

[1] Anthony Wood relates, that he had seen, "in the *Palace-Treasury at Westminster*, a bundle of books, written, as is supposed, by Cranmer, and by Dr. Clerk, bishop of Bath and Wells, on Henry's divorce, on the regal supremacy, and against cardinal Pole." Ath. Ox. *W. Knight.* These were probably removed at a later period. Many entire papers on the first two subjects, and the drafts of several others relating to them, are now in the State-Paper Office.

[2] Gerdesii Miscell. ii. 647.

[3] Pref. to the Life of Ridley, p. vii. and the Life, B. v. p. 10.

[4] Among the Letters of the Martyrs. Given to the College by Sir Walter Mildmay. Catalog. MSS. Angl. et Heb. 1697. Foxe has printed many of them. Coverdale, more, in a separate volume, 4to. 1564. Some are also added to the edition of his Answer to Gardiner in 1580.

of Emanuel College, Cambridge. It is probable that in the book-rooms of other societies, foreign as well as domestic, letters written by him may yet be found. Bale mentions indeed among the published writings of the archbishop, *one book of letters to learned men.* But, as the inquisitive and accurate Henry Wharton has observed, "[1] the archbishop's letters to learned men were never either by himself or others collected into one or more books, especially at that time: but it was Bale's foolish way to account to every great man whom he hath placed in his rhapsody of writers, *one book of epistles.*"

Of other works, ascribed to him by Bale, which we know not where to find, the following is a list.

[2] Concerning not marrying the brother's wife, two books; the task that must have been imposed upon him by Henry, and completed in order to the divorce from Catharine.

[3] The reasons that led him to oppose the Six Articles.

Twelve books of theological common-places. Perhaps, however, these are no other than the Lambeth volumes mentioned in the preceding notes, and those which are presently mentioned as recovered by archbishop Parker.

[1] Corrections of Strype in p. 898.

[2] See the first vol. of the present work, p. 21.

[3] Ibid. 280.

One book concerning the Eucharist with Luther.

[1] Against the purgatory of the Church of Rome, two books.

[2] Concerning justification, two books.

[3] Against the pope's supremacy.

[4] Against the sacrifice of the mass, and against the adoration of the bread, one book.

Confutation of eighty-eight articles devised and proposed by a convocation in Henry's reign.

Other writings, mentioned by Bale as Cranmer's, are merely the repetitions, with some variations in the titles, of what have already been described.

Burnet mentions a speech of the archbishop on the power of Christian bishops, in 1534, which he supposes to be lost. In the State-Paper Office there exists, however, a paper, *De sacerdotum et*

[1] Strype supposes, that this and the next article may mean no other than the two treatises on *purgatory*, and *justification*, at the end of the Institution.

[2] In the State-Paper Office there is a valuable paper *De justificatione*. I have copied part of it in the first vol. of the present work, p. 341. n.

[3] "This was the declaration against the papal supremacy, said to be put forth by the bishops, in 1536, upon occasion of Pole's book of *Ecclesiastical Union*." Strype. In the State-Paper Office, *De potestate et primatu papæ*, is one of the Cranmer remains.

[4] Supposed by Strype to have been what Cranmer had written, while in prison, in reply to Gardiner. See the present vol. pp. 255, 256.

episcoporum ordine ac ministerio. The historian of the Reformation also speaks of Cranmer's letters to Osiander. These he had seen; but Strype inquired after them in vain. Strype was more successful in obtaining the original letter of lord Burghley, in which the statesman acknowledged that he possessed [1] five or six volumes of Cranmer's writings. Two of these are supposed to be the volumes in the Lambeth library, of which I have given an account: Two more, to be the collection of common-places from the Fathers, which archbishop Parker [2] recovered and caused to be copied, and which are now in the Royal collection in the British Museum. The rest, of which the loss cannot but be deeply deplored, while they would probably have illustrated many incidents hitherto insufficiently explained, might also have presented to fresh admiration the character of the archbishop.

To his labours the debt of gratitude from this country is indeed already immense. When we look back to the difficulties with which he had to contend, " [3] we admire him for doing so much," it has been well observed, " rather than censure

[1] Burghley's letter is printed in Strype's Life of Parker, B. 2. ch. 15.

[2] Strype, Life of Abp. Parker, B. 2. ch. 15. The biographer has given the heads of these common places, in his Append. to the Life, B. 2. No. 23.

[3] Ess. on Church Reform. 1828, p. 5.

him for not doing more;" we honour him, as the guide that led the way to "[1] the admiration of ancient authors, the hate of the schoolmen, the exact study of languages, the efficacy of preaching," the establishment of our civil liberty, and our improvement in science and morals. For to the Reformation, although it has been said to be left incomplete, at least we attribute these blessings and advantages; while to him, the father of it, our Church also, we have seen, principally owes the foundation of her doctrine and discipline.

The character of the archbishop, personal and intellectual, as drawn by two of his contemporaries, deserves especial attention. "[2] He was a gentleman," says Osiander, "of good birth and quality; had an aspect and presence that carried dignity with it, an incredible sweetness of manners, and learning beyond the common degrees of it; was benign and liberal towards all, and especially to those that were studious and of good literature. Rarely to be found in the age, in which he lived, were his wisdom, prudence, fortitude, temperance, justice; a singular love towards his country, the highest faithfulness to his sovereign, a contempt of earthly things, a love of heavenly, and a most ardent study towards the evangelic

[1] Lord Bacon.

[2] Osiand. Epist. Ded. ante Harmon. Evang. Strype.

truth, sincere religion, and Christ's glory." Such was Cranmer about the time he attained his high station in the Church. Behold him now, when exercising the duties of that station in the reign of Edward, as represented to us next by Peter Martyr. " [1] To all the kingdom his godliness, prudence, faithfulness, and singular virtues, were known. With the grace and favour of Christ he was so well adorned, as that, though others are the children of wrath, yet in him piety, and divine knowledge, and other virtues, might seem to be naturally born and bred, such deep root in him they had taken; so that I often wished and professed," says this learned foreigner, " that I should esteem it, as a great benefit vouchsafed by God, to come as near as might be to his virtues, which in him I admired as the wonderful gifts of God. Towards myself and others, that fled into England for religion, the kindness and humanity of the archbishop were such, that if I should render just thanks, and speak of them as they deserved, I must do nothing but tell of them."

Indefatigable, from his earliest days, in the pursuit of knowledge, Cranmer soon acquired, at Cambridge, the proud [2] distinction that ranked him amongst the most learned of his society. Of

[1] P. Martyris Ep. Ded. ante librum de Eucharist. Strype.

[2] " Ex isto inquam Collegio Jesu, *viros doctissimos* novi, et *in primis Thomam Cranmerum*." Bale, cent. 8, cap. lvii.

an acute and vigorous understanding, he was probably indebted more to his own application, than to the assistance of his academical tutor; for "[1] the scholar of such an one I was," he tells us, "who when he came to any hard chapter which he well understood not, would find some pretty toy to shift it off, and to skip over to another chapter of which he could better skill!" Of the Greek and Hebrew, the new objects of study at the beginning of the sixteenth century, he became a master. The Scriptures were thus critically opened to him; and he proclaimed their truths with a voice, of which "the sound immediately went throughout the land," and was heard with rapture; for, with the glad tidings of salvation, it put to flight the many terrors of a fearful ignorance. Deeply learned himself, he became the zealous patron of learning. Of his influence with Henry he accordingly availed himself, in suggesting the establishment of the regius professorships in Oxford and Cambridge. His wish to encourage in both the Universities that especial knowledge, and spirit of inquiry, which distinguished the foreign Reformers, consigned Peter Martyr to the one, Bucer and Fagius to the other, probably more to both. When Edward had ascended the throne, one of his first designs was to found numerous free-schools; a purpose, we may be sure, that was

[1] His Answer to Gardiner, 307.

forwarded by Cranmer, who ever was a zealous advocate for the education of youth. To impart spiritual instruction also, where our own language was little understood, Cranmer then also recommended the measure, which bishop Bedell afterwards attempted with success, for the clergy in Ireland to learn the Irish language. In a word, he left no means untried that might diffuse among the people the benefits of knowledge, and the blessings of religion.

From Erasmus he appears to have derived not only his taste for sound learning, but that independence of thinking which first led him to contemn superstition. Both of them, in particular, inveighed against the papal indulgences, and against the pernicious influence of the papal festivals. Both of them maintained the freedom of the human will. Cranmer was to Erasmus, I may add, what Warham had been; a kind and steady friend, as soon as he became archbishop; and Erasmus acknowledged the obligation, not without allusion to the integrity for which Henry, and to the moderation for which the people, loved the primate. As a writer, Cranmer may be pronounced usually clear and perspicuous, often animated, sometimes pathetic, reminding us occasionally, in his style, of the elegance, as well as vigour, which distinguishes the venerable Book, in forming which his share was very large, our Common Prayer

It has been usually said of his learning, that to his profession it was chiefly confined; that he was the best-read theologian of his time, nor less distinguished for his skill in the canon and civil law, and for his opinions as a casuist. Yet among his biographers there are some, who relate that he was eminent also for his attainments "[1] *in the liberal arts and sciences,* though more for divinity, which, when as one of the three censors he examined candidates, he said he expected not in the difficult trifles of Lombard, but in the sacred sense of the Scripture, the ancient doctrine of the Fathers, the grave canons of Councils, the solid politeness of the Greek and Hebrew learning; and which he believed, as well as taught, in his temperance, his meekness, (so placable, so courteous, that to offend him was the way to ingratiate with him,) his discreet moderation, and his grave resolution, equally above the smiles and frowns of fortune."

The same pens inform us, "that he spake little to others, and conferred much within himself. Three words of his could do more than three hours of others: he would say, as Victorinus did, *There is a time to say nothing, there is a*

[1] Lives of famous men at the University of Cambridge, by Morris Drake Morris, MSS. Brit. Mus. vol. i. 77, seq. What he here says of Cranmer is borrowed, however, almost word for word, from Lloyd's State Worthies

time to say something, but there never is a time to say all things. That king, who awed all others, feared him."—Indeed the cautious exercise of his influence over the tyrannical and capricious Henry, as well as the temper and judgment with which, amid the intrigues and the contentions in Edward's reign, he founded the great system of benefaction to his country, decisively attest in him higher capacities of understanding than those of Ridley and his other coadjutors.

"One thing he commonly used," says his affectionate secretary, "wherein many did [then] discommend him, which was this: He always bare a good face and countenance unto the Papists; and would, both in word and deed, do very much for them, pardoning their offences: On the other side, somewhat over-severe against the Protestants. Which being perceived not to be done but upon some purpose, on a time a friend of his declared unto him, that therein he did very much harm, thus encouraging the former, and also discouraging the latter. He answered, What will ye have a man do to him who is not yet come to the knowledge of the truth of the Gospel, nor perchance as yet called, and whose vocation is to me uncertain? Shall we, perhaps in his journey coming toward us, by severity and cruel behaviour overthrow him, and as it were in his voyage stop him? I take not this the way to allure men to embrace the doc-

trine of the Gospel. And if it be a true rule of our Saviour Christ to do good for evil, then let such, as are not yet come to favour our religion, learn to follow the doctrine of the Gospel by our example in using them friendly and charitably." I have copied with pleasure this illustration of his uniting with a most comprehensive intellect a liberal and ingenuous heart. In maintaining his opinions indeed he was always candid, and open to conviction; not ashamed to acknowledge mistake; exemplifying the truth, that with men of the noblest natures humility is ever found to dwell. Hence, in the settlement of our church-government, he renounced the Erastian opinions to which he had appeared to incline; hence in his last reply to his adversaries, as in a former one to bishop Gardiner, he denied not the errors of his earlier days.

The engaging affability of his manners contributed also not a little to the completion of his designs. His kind and prudent conduct as a diocesan, still more. It was his study to place in towns where the inhabitants were numerous, and the salaries small, able ministers with sufficient stipends: It was his delight often to preach in them himself. "It is indeed surprising," as Gilpin remarks, "how much he was beloved and how few enemies he made, when we consider that his whole life was a constant opposition to the opinions and prejudices of the times. Those, whom

he could not persuade, he never disobliged; and a harsh measure he considered only as another name for an imprudent one." Even Pole acknowledged to him, that he was no stranger to the high esteem which he enjoyed for gentleness and clemency.

Severe only to himself, he was as unwearied in his attention to business, as in his pursuit of learning. His time was thus employed: At five o'clock he usually rose, and till nine continued in his study. After breakfast, part of the morning was spent in business public or private; at eleven was the chapel-hour; at twelve, the call to dinner, after which he devoted an hour to conversation with his friends, or to the amusement of the chess-board. Again to his study he then resorted, until the evening chapel-bell rang at five; and after the service he usually walked till six, which was the hour of supper, when he took little, often no refreshment, then from seven to eight again walked, gave the next hour to his books, and at nine retired to his bed. Foxe relates, [1] that the archbishop always accustomed himself to read and write in a standing posture; esteeming constant sitting very pernicious to a studious man.

Of his domestic habits, and private character, all that we know is amiable. As a master, he was much beloved. "His hospitality and charities

[1] Copied by Gilpin.

were great and noble, equal to his station; greater often than his abilities." We have witnessed him almost always poor; for his generosity to strangers, as well as his countrymen, was boundless. His hospitality indeed we have seen suspected: but we have also seen it vindicated. Among other instances of his charity, [1] he is said to have fitted up his manor-house at Bekesbourne in Kent for the use of wounded soldiers, who should be landed on the southern coast of the island; supplying it with a physician, a surgeon, nurses, and every thing proper as well for food as medicine; and the patients, on their recovery, with money to convey them to their homes. To the establishment of hospitals indeed, as well as of grammar-schools, his was the noble wish to have seen a very extensive appropriation of the alienated monastic revenues.

But, to use the words of Strype, "I intend not these collections for such a panegyric of the archbishop, as to make the world believe him void of all faults or frailties, the condition of human nature. He lived in such critical times and under such princes, and was necessarily involved in such affairs, as exposed him to greater temptations than ordinary. And if any blemishes shall by curious observers be espied in him, he may therefore seem the more pardonable; and his great exemplary

goodness and usefulness in the Church of God, may make ample amends for some errors."

The general objection, as Gilpin adds, that seems to bear the heaviest upon him, is founded on the pliancy of his temper. If he means his submissions to Henry, it ought to be considered that had he acted otherwise, at least in some respects, he would not only have forfeited his life, but perhaps have entirely ruined the glorious cause of which he was the leader and supporter. In great trials too we have beheld him certainly evincing the dauntless spirit of resolution. By many writers, however, constitutional timidity, or defect of firmness, has been pronounced a characteristic of the archbishop. By his faithful secretary Morice, indeed, has been mentioned what seems to imply that himself was conscious of this infirmity, of which he did not consider nature, but the cruelty of his earliest teacher, to have been the cause. I cannot close these memorials of him, without copying so remarkable a statement. Such was the tyranny of the pedagogue, [1] that the tender and fine wits of his scholars were appalled, and driven to an abhorrence, instead of being encouraged to the cultivation, of learning; " [2] their memories also were thereby so mutilated and wounded, *that for his part*," said Cranmer himself to the secretary, " *he lost much of that*

[1] See vol. i. p. 2.

[2] MSS. C. C. C. Camb.

benefit of memory, and audacity in his youth that by nature was given to him, which he never could recover, as he divers times reported." Self-examination, of which we believe him to have been a fervent practiser, often perhaps awakened this melancholy thought, but not without unmurmuring submission to the will of God. To know God and ourselves was his motto:

"NOSCE TEIPSUM ET DEUM."

THE END.

LONDON:
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE

00110911

Digitized with financial assistance from
Shri Brihad Bhartiya Samaj
on 20 February, 2020